HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
VOLUME LIV JULY, 1961 NUMBER 3

WORLD AGES AND THE BODY POLITIC

H. J. ROSE
ST. ANDREWS, SCOTLAND

WHEN, at an unknown but manifestly early period, speculation regarding the duration and destiny of the world began, the thinkers of those days had two analogies to guide them, and consequently two divergent conclusions were reached. The first was the recurrent cycle of the seasons; the second, the growth, maturity, decay and death of the human and all other animal bodies. Reasoning from the one, some arrived at the conclusion that the world, at least the earth and mankind, had passed and would always continue to pass through a series of epochs, limited in number, which when they had ended would recommence, and so on indefinitely. From the other datum the result was reached that as a man dies and does not come to life again (for even the fairly wide-spread and early doctrine of reincarnation supposed only that the soul would be given a new earthly body of some kind, not that the whole individual would return), so the earth, or the universe generally, would grow old and die and that would be the end of it. It is the purpose of this paper to examine these two ideas and one or two offshoots of them as they are known to have appeared in the two classical civilizations of Europe, and especially in Greece, and if possible to draw some tentative conclusions as to which, if either, can be found more characteristic of native thought.

Our earliest informant is of course Hesiod, whose date I suppose to be sometime in the eighth century B.C. His excursus on the Five Ages is too well-known to be treated in any detail; [1] in a sense it does but echo in a yet more pessimistic tone and with much more elaboration Homer's repeated assurance that the men of the Heroic Age, so to call it by anticipation, were far superior

[1] Hesiod, Works, 109 ff.

to his contemporaries, οἷοι νῦν βροτοί εἰσιν. The men of the far-off Golden Age were found worthy, when at last they ended their long and blissful lives, to become good daimones, who still exist on the earth and are guardians of men. Even the much inferior Silver people attained daimonic rank, but below ground. The Bronze men perished at their own violent hands and left no name behind when they went to the House of Hades; a turn for the better was marked by the age of the heroes, some of whom when their wars and voyagings had made an end of them departed to the Islands of the Blessed, but the present or Iron race is evil and will become steadily worse. So much Hesiod definitely states, but there is an expression which perhaps throws light on what he supposed the ultimate future of the world to be. "Would that I," he says, "were not one of the fifth race of men, but either had died beforehand or else were born later." This last phrase may be nothing but rhetoric, the common Greek trick of saying something both positively and negatively, but if it is really meant to be taken seriously, it hints that there is a better time coming, and this one would naturally suppose is a return of the Golden Age. In other words, Hesiod may have believed in, or speculated about the possibility of, a recurrent series of world-epochs, each worse than the one before (apart from the parenthesis of the Heroic Age), but with the prospect of the degeneration stopping and the good times coming again.

When we quit Hesiod, in whom we may see the first stirrings of what was to be philosophic thought, and pass to the philosophers proper, we come across views more or less like the cyclic idea which is possibly in Hesiod. Anaximandros held that [2] there was a certain reciprocity between the different materials or forces arising out of the primal matter, the Unbounded, which has neither beginning nor end in time or space. These forces are opposites, as cold and hot, and Anaximandros, in what Simplicius not unjustly styles rather poetical language, represents them as wronging one another and consequently under the necessity of making amends; which, it would seem, signifies that now one opposite, now the other prevails.[3] This is not exactly a cyclic

[2] Fgts. 2, 3 Mullach, fgt. 1 Diels-Kranz, cf. A 9.

[3] It is necessary to speak with great reserve in discussing Anaximandros or any of

movement, but reciprocal, and there appears to be no reason why it should not, in Anaximandros' opinion, continue forever. Empedokles with his four elements and two opposing forces of attraction and repulsion, or as he called them love and strife, is more definite, or at least we have more of him to go by. He also postulated [4] an alternation, apparently going on forever, between the two opposing forces. "A twofold tale I will tell; now the one grows to be alone out of more than one, and now splits, so as to be more instead of one." This he elaborated apparently at some length. The effect of "love" is the Sphairos, which seems to have been conceived as a living creature without projecting parts of any kind but a perfectly globular plenum within which none of the familiar elements such as light and air could be discerned separately. "Strife" has the opposite effect. But he insists that the process goes on indefinitely κατὰ κύκλον. His universe is as completely fluctuating as that of Herakleitos himself. We thus have once more a perpetual recurrence, comparable, as I have said, to that of the seasons.

If we now pass to the later and more developed philosophies, we find Plato maintaining, not only in the pretty tale of Solon's interview with the wise men of Egypt [5] but in the more serious discussion in the Laws [6] a catastrophic theory of the history of mankind and his environment. At certain intervals, determined by the position of the heavenly bodies, a great destruction takes place, now by fire and now by flood (Timaeus), or from any one of a variety of disasters (Laws), of which, however, only widespread deluges are discussed at any length; while in the myth of the Politicus [7] we have the picturesque idea that the universe, hampered by its material nature, is incapable of the unchanging activity which belongs to deity only, and therefore does the best

---

the early Ionians, by reason of the unsatisfactory nature of our information. Their writings are all lost, and we are reduced to the reports of authors who lived many centuries later and certainly in many cases got their accounts, not from the Ionians' own books, but from doxographies and the like. This has been abundantly illustrated in the case of Thales by D. R. Dicks in C.Q., N.S. ix (1959), pp. 294–309.

[4] Fgts. 17, 26 and 28 Diels-Kranz, lines 70 ff., 90 f. Mullach.

[5] Tim. 32 c, d.

[6] Laws 677a ff.

[7] Politicus 269c ff. For a recent discussion of the myth, see H. Herter in Bonner Jahrbücher, Heft 158 (1958), pp. 106–117.

it can by moving in a constant circle under its own guidance, while at certain intervals God takes the helm and moves it the other way, thus reversing all its usual processes; a piece of philosophical imagination which, as I will explain later, caught Vergil's fancy. But to return to the non-mythical, one might almost say geological, hypothesis of the Laws, the repeated catastrophes leave the earth depopulated, save for a few dwellers in out-of-the-way places such as mountain-tops, and these, being simple folk, perforce must climb the long ascent to civilization unaided. Here certainly we have an unending cycle, from savagery, albeit of an amiable kind, to high culture, then back to the beginnings again. Apparently this concept of the master's old age impressed his hearers, for his greatest and most original disciple refers to it in passing, without refutation or discussion, when he speaks of "the first men, whether they were sprung from the earth or survivors of a destruction of some sort," and goes on to say what their habits and customs would probably be.[8] Apparently he did not take it very seriously, since he speaks of it in one breath with the popular notion that the first men grew out of the ground. Stoicism was but pressing this or a like theory to its ultra-logical conclusion and adding its favorite astrological ideas when it postulated alternating conflagrations and deluges which destroy the material universe, only to have it start again on a new cycle of existence which exactly repeats the old.

Naturally the Epicureans were opposed to any such view. Since, in their scheme of things, the universes, infinite in number, consisted each of a conglomeration of atoms, and since every such conglomeration must sooner or later dissolve, save only the subtle bodies of the gods, who are also out of the reach of shocks from without, it followed that there could be no eternal duration, whether broken by catastrophes insufficient to destroy the system completely or unbroken, and hence no cycle of destruction and renewal nor any alternation such as we have seen postulated.[9] Indeed, according to its one really eloquent exponent, Epicureanism found that the earth showed clear signs of the weakness of

[8] Arist., Pol. 1269a4 ff. Cf., however, Aristotle, Jaeger, Aristoteles, p. 131, n. 4.
[9] The fullest exposition of all this is of course Lucretius, v, 91 ff.

old age.[10] But the increasing piety of the centuries which followed Lucretius put Epicureanism more and more out of fashion; it was no friend of that school who was, centuries later, to declare *senuit mundus*.[11] The remaining philosophies tended to believe in a more or less completely eternal world.

In this connection one can hardly avoid dealing, however briefly, with perhaps the most famous of all expositions of the cyclic order of world-ages; I refer of course to Vergil's Fourth Eclogue. Here we have, in plain words, and on the authority, as the author himself tells us, of a Sibylline oracle (Cumaei carminis), whatever its date and origin were, a theory of world-ages which recur; *magnus ab integro saeclorum nascitur ordo*. As a result, the Golden Age is to come again, not immediately, but within the span of a human life, and soon enough for the poet, then about thirty years old, to hope that in his old age he might be able to celebrate its advent and the glorious deeds of the expected child who was to bring it. Whether he was an Epicurean at that time or not, he could entertain at least a literary belief in such bright hopes, and he added, as I have long been convinced, a reminiscence of Plato to his Sibylline prophecy.[12] For as the Golden Age draws nearer, there are to be more wars, a new Troy and a new Achilles to go forth against it; in other words, as I think, the Hesiodic order of the ages is used, briefly and without any details, but in reverse, according to the Platonic myth. One reason for holding such a view is that it gives a typically Alexandrian combination of themes from different authors, here superimposing Plato on the Sibyl and Hesiod on Plato; and Vergil was at that time of his life strongly under Alexandrian influence.

The school of thought which finally triumphed in antiquity and for a long while afterwards would not hear of any cyclic arrangement of the ages of the world. Christianity had inherited from Judaism the imposing picture of a final Day of the Lord, and by the time of St. Augustine it was the generally received doctrine that there were to be seven ages, corresponding to the seven days of the creation-myth in Genesis. Some even went

[10] Ibid., ii, 1150 ff.
[11] Augustine, Sermo lxxxi, 8.
[12] See C.Q. xviii (1924), 115 f.

further and were of the opinion that each of these periods was to be of a thousand years, since that is declared to be as one day in the sight of God.[13] Augustine himself did not agree with such calculations, at any rate with regard to the current age, which in his opinion was the sixth; it is of course to be remembered that neither the Christian theologians nor anyone else had then any just conception of the real age of the earth, but could go only by Hebrew or other traditions of the beginnings of things, and the Bishop of Hippo could quote Biblical authority for the unpredictability of the Last Day.[14] But all were agreed that the world was coming to a definite and final end, whether in a thousand years' time or after some other interval. Thus, curiously enough, Epicurean and Christian were in agreement on one point at any rate.

So far then we have found two differing systems, one involving and the other denying some sort of indefinite recurrence of world-ages. Each has, as might be expected, its variants; only Epicureans and Christians evolved orthodoxies, the latter not without much difficulty and many embittered controversies. This same ill-assorted pair, then, form a little group by themselves,[15] as against all the rest. If, then, we attempt to sum up our results with a view to looking for native development as against foreign influence, there seems to be no strong evidence either way. Hesiod, it is now recognized, was influenced to some extent, directly or indirectly, from the East, as his account of the succession of divine dynasties shows, and therefore it is not absurd to suppose that he got his idea of world-ages from that quarter, though I can think of no cogent evidence that he did so. Again, considering the geographical and political relations of Ionia, there is nothing against the supposition that Anaximandros and the rest took hints from thinkers belonging to the great monarchies just outside the fluctuating boundaries of their country. That

[13] 2 Peter 3, 8, half-quoting Ps. xc (lxxxix Septuagint), 4.

[14] Augustine discusses the question several times, see Serm. cxxv, 4, in Psalm. vi, 1, epist. cxcix, 17, C.D. xx, 7. His authorities for opposing attempts to calculate the date of the Last Day are Matt. 14, 14, Act. 1, 7 and Thess. 5, 2.

[15] There was another and a quaint bond between them; both were solemnly warned away from the mysteries celebrated by Alexandros of Abonuteichos, Lucian, Alexander, 38, cf. 25. The reason naturally was that both, though on very different grounds, rejected Alexandros' mumbo-jumbo.

Plato was interested in the East has been sufficiently pointed out, for instance by Bidez,[16] while Aristotle takes over a Platonic idea and the Stoics seem further to develop what Plato had taught and Aristotle provisionally accepted, elaborating it after their own fashion.[17] On the other hand, every one of these authorities, from Anaximandros to Zenon and Chrysippos, was a man of keen and original mind, quite capable of shaping a new doctrine for himself and having before him, like everyone else, the pattern of the recurrent phenomena of the natural year to serve as a model for his thought. I can see no sufficient grounds for saying dogmatically that cyclic or reciprocal schemes of world-ages were or were not of non-Greek origin, though such things as the Stoics' astrology and Vergil's Sibylline oracle seem to point a rather wavering and uncertain finger eastwards.

I pass now to the second half of my title and propose to consider the scheme of ages, not of the world in general but of that part of the world which most closely concerns and concerned men, the State. Here we have the valuable guidance of Censorinus,[18] who expressly gives Varro as his authority. After discussing the meaning of *saeculum* and its length as variously computed, he appeals to the *rituales Etruscorum libri*, though only at second hand (*in quis scriptum esse fertur*), for we have no reason to suppose that he could understand Etruscan. Beginning with the day on which a city is founded or a State constituted (normally the two would be one), take the age at death of the longest-lived person born on that day; this will give the length of the first *saeculum* of that State. Taking the population of the community on that day, the death of the longest-lived among them marks the end of the second *saeculum*, and so on. But such information is not to be had among mortals, so the gods kindly give warning of the critical date by certain portents, which Etruscan experts have noted and recorded. Concerning their own nation, they recorded in Varro's time that seven complete *saecula* had passed, varying in length from 100 to 119 years, the eighth was then cur-

[16] J. Bidez, Eos, ou Platon et l'Orient, Brussels, 1945.

[17] If this is so, it may be taken as strengthening A. D. Nock's contention (J.R.S., xlix, 1959, p. 1) that "Stoicism is from beginning to end a purely Greek phenomenon."

[18] De die natali 17, 5–6 (p. 44 Mommsen).

rent, and there were to be but two more, after which *finem fore nominis Etrusci.* There is evidence that this doctrine made no small impression on the Romans, and that they inclined to apply at least some part of it to their own State. Apart from the tales of signs and wonders which proclaimed the end of the eighth *saeculum*, Lucan, by Housman's highly probable reading of Phars. vii, 387, calls the age following upon the Civil Wars the ninth,[19] and Juvenal, combining Etruscan and Hesiodic lore, says[20] that he is living in that same ninth *saeculum*, and it is worse than Hesiod's Iron Age, too bad to be named after any metal.

In this doctrine of *saecula*, then, we have a distinct pointer towards the East, for according to what seems to me the only probable account of Etruscan origins, they are Asians who for some reason immigrated to Italy and established themselves there. If Herodotos' theory is right, that they came from Lydia,[21] I think we may find a connection between their ancestry and their known practices regarding divination from lightning when in their new homes. Apollo, still according to Herodotos, told Kroisos that after vainly trying to avert the doom which hung over him until the next generation, he had succeeded in getting it postponed for three years.[22] Now it was a received doctrine of Etruscan *haruspices* that certain electrical phenomena portended a destiny which could not be averted, but could be delayed for a maximum of ten years in the case of an individual, thirty in that of a State.[23] Here I ask leave to indulge in a small flight of fancy. It seems to me that the notion of a fate which could be delayed, whether by divine intervention or otherwise, is definitely not Greek. Greek destinies are mostly conditional; if Achilles goes to Troy, his life will be short but glorious; if he stays at home, he will live long but ingloriously. If Laios begets a son, disaster awaits him and his city; if he refrains, no ill consequences, apparently, are to fol-

[19] "Hae facient dextrae (i.e., the hands of those who fought at Pharsalus are responsible for) quidquid nona (non *codd.*) explicat aetas, ut uacet a ferro."

[20] Juvenal 13, 28.

[21] Hdt. i, 94, 5–7.

[22] Ibid., 91, 2–3.

[23] The relevant passages concerning this theory, which are somewhat confused and contradictory, are conveniently assembled by Thulin, Die etruskische Disciplin, i, p. 81. The authorities are all Latin, their source presumably Caecina, at first hand or otherwise.

low on his sin against his host Pelops and consequently against Zeus Xenios. No definite dates are attached to these and scores of other oracular warnings; still less is it suggested that the events foretold can be somehow postponed. As Herodotos' whole account of the dealings of Kroisos with Apollo has a recognizedly Delphic flavor, I think it probable that the Delphic clergy had picked up the idea from some Oriental informant, perhaps one of the Lydian's messengers. Now we have seen that the duration of a State may be ten *saecula*, whereas the longest human life is but one *saeculum*. I therefore feel it to be plausible at least that the original doctrine was thirty years' postponement for a State, three years for an individual. So much for conjecture.

Apart from Roman adaptations of the Etruscan doctrine of *saecula*, one or two of their writers drew a parallel between the stages through which a human life passes and those of a State. Seneca, says Lactantius,[24] divided the whole of Roman history into periods, namely infancy (time of Romulus), childhood (under the later kings), adolescence (from the expulsion of the Tarquins to the end of the Punic Wars), young maturity (wide-ranging territorial expansion), then the onset of old age (Civil Wars), and finally decrepitude and second childhood (Empire), *tanquam sustentare se ipsa non ualeret nisi adminiculo regentium uteretur*. Since we know from the younger Seneca's fragmentary life of his father that it was the elder man who wrote a history, we may be sure of the authorship of the passage which Lactantius paraphrases; and since we know from the same source that the history began with the beginning of the Civil Wars, it is clear that the reflection on the ages of man and of the State was an excursus of some kind, perhaps a preface. In any case, the figure made some impression on the reading public, for Florus [25] borrows it without acknowledgment to deck his outline of Roman history. Here the figure is so natural that it might have occurred to anyone at any time. Indeed fragments of it are still current. As a Canadian, I used to hear something of the "infant industries" of my country and the need for a high protective tariff to guard their tender growth. To speak of a "young" republic or other

[24] Lactantius, diuin. inst. vii, 15, 14.
[25] Florus, prooem. 4 ff.

community is nothing new, and we have heard more than once of a country "coming of age." There is of course no guarantee that the elder Seneca originated it. A trained and enthusiastic rhetorician with a prodigious memory, he may quite possibly have taken over or adapted a figure he had heard in a *declamatio*. But at all events, we may be sure that it is not later than his time.

Thus we have seen that speculation regarding the world at large and also individual States took the two forms I mentioned at the beginning, the recurrent and the non-recurrent hypotheses. I think the examples given have also made it fairly clear that neither of them can claim with much persuasiveness to be either Greek or barbarian in origin, although some particular instances may point one way or the other. On the whole, this is what we might expect. I have already mentioned Hesiod's eastern connections and the probability of the Ionians being influenced by the ideas of their neighbors; so much for the earlier speculators. For the post-Aristotelians, we must remember the powerful backwash from the tide of Alexander's conquests, and in the particular case of Vergil, his use of the poet's privilege to incorporate in his work any ideas which find favor with him. It is rare to find anything like the Etruscan *saecula* which we can attribute to either an eastern or a western current of thought, and even here, it is not to be forgotten that the Etruscans were very receptive of foreign ideas and show here and there, even to our scanty knowledge, signs of their own beliefs being somewhat modified. On the whole therefore I end with the unsatisfactory verdict NON LIQVET.

THE FOUNDATION-DATE OF THE ALEXANDRIAN PTOLEMAIEIA

P. M. FRASER

All Souls College, Oxford, England

The subject of this brief note is not new, but good reasons exist for reopening the topic. The evidence for the establishment of this festival in honor of Soter at Alexandria by Ptolemy Philadelphus consisted until recently of the decree passed by the Nesiotic League (The League of Islanders) agreeing to send theoroi to it,[1] which has been regularly dated to ca. 281–279 B.C. In 1954 I published two fragments of a decree, in identical terms, from Delphi, according recognition to the festival, and agreeing to send theoroi, emanating from the Amphictyonic Council.[2] This decree I dated on the basis of the Nesiotic decree, which, after a detailed discussion, I placed, in the usual way, in 280–279 B.C.[3] In 1958 the situation was altered by the publication by J. Bousquet [4] of what he claimed to be the prescript of the decree published by myself, containing the date in the form of the eponymous Delphic archon Pleiston, whom he assigned to 266–265 B.C. (or less probably to 270–269).[5] Faced with the apparently open contradiction between this date and the traditional date of the Nesiotic decree, he pointed out that this latter date, ca. 280 B.C., did not appear to be certain, and concluded that it was necessary to abstain from dating the event on the present evidence.[6] In JEA, 45, 1959, p. 97, no. (44) I promised to return to this problem, which is of interest to all students of

[1] IG, xii, 7, 506 = Syll.[3], 390.

[2] BCH, 78, 1954, pp. 49–62 = SEG, xiii, 351 (one fragment had been previously published by Pomtow). For further details regarding the inscription I refer to my article and to that of Bousquet, for which see below note 4.

[3] Ibid., pp. 55 ff.

[4] BCH, 82, 1958, pp. 77–82.

[5] Ibid., p. 81, cf. p. 76, note 4. The date in Spring 269 or 265 is established by the fact that a decree survives from the same year (published by Bousquet, ibid., pp. 74–75), but with a different set of Amphictyonic officials, which is dated to the Pythian festival which always occurred during the autumn session of the Amphictyony (see Bousquet, ibid., p. 76, note 2); consequently the present decree must belong to the second semester and the spring session (ca. April).

[6] Ibid., p. 81: "Il faudra donc renoncer à fixer avec précision la date du décret des Nésiotes lui-même, et suspendre son jugement jusqu'à ce qu'on ait découvert un argument qui dépasse la vraisemblance et atteigne à la certitude; pour l'instant il n'y en a pas."

Ptolemaic history, and in particular of Ptolemaic ruler-cult, and this I now do in a brief compass.[7]

First of all, we may, I think, regard it as certain that the new fragment is part of the same inscription, as Bousquet claimed, and that the new decree is correctly dated to either one or the other of the two years admitted by him, namely 270–269 and 266–265, and more precisely to the spring of either 269 or 265, even though the new fragment with the dating element does not join the other fragments. No satisfactory alternative exists in view of Bousquet's positive statement to this effect, made in the light of his great experience and authority in matters of Delphian epigraphy.[8] We must therefore accept the fragment with the date as belonging to the decree, and either (a) adopt the date proposed by Bousquet in broad terms (269 or 265) as the true date of the establishment of the Alexandrian Ptolemaieia, or, if this proves to be inadmissible, (b) adopt the only alternative solution, that the traditional date for the establishment of the Ptolemaieia is in fact correct, and that the Amphictyonic consent was for some reason withheld for a number of years.

We may first consider briefly the contents of the Nesiotic decree and the internal evidence for its date.[9] Its contents may be summarized thus. At an earlier date a letter was sent by Philocles, King of the Sidonians, and Bacchon, the Ptolemaic Nesiarch, to the cities of the League inviting them to send delegates to Samos to discuss the festival which Ptolemy Philadelphus was establishing in his father's honor in Alexandria, and now the delegates have

[7] Bousquet's discovery called forth a paean of joy from J. and L. Robert, Bull. Epig. 1959, no. 194, but they made no contribution to the problem of the chronology raised by the new text.

[8] I may quote here Bousquet's statement regarding the similarity of the new fragment to those published by me: "Le raccord de ce haut de stèle à fronton moulure avec les fragments publiés par Fraser n'est pas matériel; il reste entre la liste et le corps du décret une lacune qui comprend la fin de la liste et le début des considérants. Mais le rapprochment est évident quand on est en présence des pierres, car tous les indices extérieurs concordent de façon impressionnante; écriture, dimensions des lettres et des interlignes, piqueté caractéristique de la surface, — bouchardée, puis imparfaitement polie *après* gravure, car le piqueté est resté surtout dans les lettres, les interlignes sont plus lisses —, marge à gauche de 0 m.006, aspect des tranches latérales. Pour contre-épreuve, après avoir pris soin d'inspecter tous les fragments du Musée épigraphique qui pouvaient entrer en ligne de compte, je les ai trouvés tous différents à un titre quelconque, et je n'hésite pas à affirmer que le rapprochement est indubitable." (Ibid., p. 79.)

[9] The decree is inscribed on the front face of a marble stele found on Amorgos and last recorded on the neighboring islet of Nikouriá.

met and been addressed by Philocles and Bacchon. They now decree that, because of the numerous services (duly described) of Ptolemy Soter to the Greek cities, and because Philadelphus, who succeeded his father, has now shown similar liberality, and requests the Nesiotes and other Greeks to recognize the new festival as isolympic, they shall send theoroi to the festival and recognize it as requested. They add a further decision to award the king a crown, and a ruling that all constituent cities of the League are to issue similar decrees, which are to be erected in the appropriate places in the respective cities. Moreover, the delegates are to choose three theoroi to go to Alexandria to sacrifice to Ptolemy Soter and to bestow the crown on Philadelphus. After further administrative details the theoroi are named: Glaucon of Kythnos, a Naxian whose name is lost, and Kleokritos of Andros.

The first attempt to establish the date of the decree firmly was that of Holleaux, who said that it dated "sans conteste possible, de 285 ou de 283."[10] He continued "On voit par ce décret qu' à l'avènement de Philadelphe (283) ou lorsqu'il fut associé au gouvernement de son père (285), Philoklès, chargé d'honneurs et muni de pouvoirs étendus, exerçait au nom de l'Égypte une haute autorité sur les Confédérés de la mer Ægée." This date clearly derives, as the words "à l'avènement . . . ou lorsqu'il fut associé au gouvernement de son père" show, from the expression *καὶ νῦν ὁ βασιλεὺς* [Π]*τολεμαῖος, διαδεξάμενος τὴν βασιλείαν παρ*[*ὰ*] *τοῦ πατρός, κ.τ.λ.* The same view was expressed by Dittenberger a year or two later in his publication of the decree as Syll.[2] 202; his note (10), on *διαδεξάμενος τὴν βασιλείαν* reads "apparet hinc proximis post Philadelphi ad imperii (*sic*) accessionem (285 a. Chr.) temporibus haec decreta esse." However, further precision was possible, and when Hiller von Gaertringen re-edited the inscription as Syll.[3] 390 he added to Dittenberger's note the words "Tamen et Soteris morte (283) et pugna illa (i.e. Corupedion) recentiora videntur." The latter point, concerning the battle of Corupedion, derives from the fact that Samos, where the delegates were to meet, did not become Ptolemaic until after that battle, and is obviously valid. In general in recent years this date has been accepted.[11]

[10] See Holleaux, Etudes, i, p. 25.

[11] See e.g. Tarn, JHS, 31, 1911, p. 252; id., Ant. Gon. p. 104, note 29; Dürrbach,

It must be admitted that this proof is not wholly satisfactory in respect of a lower terminal date, and if this were the only evidence for the date of the inscription the new date could not be rejected out of hand. However, this is not the case.

The Nesiotic decree quite clearly distinguishes between Soter, worshipped as a god with sacrifices in the new Alexandrian festival, and Philadelphus, who receives only the honors due to a king, in the form of a crown.[12] Evidently then, Philadelphus has not yet been deified either in Alexandria or by the Nesiotes. Moreover, we now know that Philadelphus and Arsinoe were deified together in Alexandria by, or in, 272–271,[13] and Arsinoe is not mentioned in the Nesiotic decree at all. At the same time in another Nesiotic document[14] Philadelphus appears worshipped alongside his father, but without the title of god, and with no reference to Arsinoe. I do not see therefore how we can avoid the conclusion that the decree accepting the invitation to the Ptolemaieia is earlier than the second Nesiotic decree and that both are earlier than the joint deification with Arsinoe, who is not mentioned at all in either decree.

Yet again, it seems clear that the inauguration of the Ptolemaieia to which the Nesiotes and other Greeks were summoned, was part of the act of deification of Ptolemy Soter by his son, and that the period which elapsed between deification and festival must have been very brief. It follows that if the Ptolemaieia are dated to 269 or (still more) to 265 the deification of Soter will be later than the deification of Philadelphus and Arsinoe in, or before, 272–271. But it is obvious from the decree of the Nesiotes that this is not so.

Choix, p. 27; Beloch, GG, iv², 2, p. 327, etc. My own attempt to associate the *νῦν* of the main clause with *διαδεξάμενος* was rightly criticized by Bousquet, op. cit., p. 81, who points out (ibid., note 2) that the *νῦν* in line 30 similarly marks a contrast in general between Ptolemy I and Ptolemy II.

[12] The contrast between the Savior Ptolemy and King Ptolemy is explicit throughout, and the king receives only the simple gift of a crown, while the Savior receives worship and sacrifices at an altar: cf. note 14.

[13] PHib. 199; lines 12 ff.: (*ἔτους*) *ιδ*· Καλλικράτη[ς—]· | *ἐπὶ τούτου* Ἡρα[—] *δος ἦλθεν εἰς* Αἰγ[υπτίους(?)] | *καὶ πρὸς τὰ συνα*[λλάγματα] | *προσεγράφη ἱερ*[*εὺς* Ἀλεξάνδρου] | *καὶ θεῶν* Ἀδελ[*φῶν*—(?)]. Cf. Fraser, Berytus, 13, p. 134, note 46.

[14] IG, xi, 4, 1038 = Choix, 21, in honor of Sostratus. Here (lines 21 ff.) the Nesiotes are described as sacrificing to "the other Gods, Ptolemy Soter and the King."

This is perhaps all that need be said to show that the date of the Amphictyonic decree (269 or 265) can hardly be the true date of the original application, and that consequently there is no reason to disturb the existing date, ca. 280–279 as approximately correct both for the deification of Ptolemy I and for the establishment of the Ptolemaieia. Other arguments support this reasoning, but further demonstration does not seem necessary.[15]

We are consequently compelled to accept the date of the Amphictyonic decree — immaterial whether it be 269 or 265 — as the date of the Amphictyonic acceptance only, and to assume that the Amphictyons delayed their reply for a decade or more, and that when they did reply they did so in precisely the same terms as those who had replied ten years earlier, even though the festival had been performed three times in the interval. It must be admitted that this is not a very acceptable solution. Although instances of delayed acceptance of such festivals seem to have occurred, this was apparently unusual and only occurred either when the body giving a late acceptance had not been in existence at the time of the original application; or else when a second invitation was issued at a later date to stimulate interest in the festival.[16] Certainly a gap of as long as ten years is very remarkable. Nevertheless, whatever may have been the reason for the delay, this solution seems the only feasible one in this instance.

This short note is not intended to explore all the ramifications of the problem. Its aim is simply to show that acceptance of the date of the Amphictyonic document as the true date of the foundation of the Ptolemaieia creates a series of historical paradoxes, which can hardly be true, and to express the opinion that the traditional date has yet to be overturned.

[15] As, for example, that it is unlikely that Philadelphus would have established a new and magnificent festival in 270–269 in honor of his father, in respect of which envoys were sent out at the latest in the early spring of 269, when Arsinoe had only died in the previous July; and, alternatively, that at the later date 266–265, we are in the midst, or on the brink, of the Chremonidean War; and finally (less cogent) that Philocles' age in 270 (let alone in 265) must have been such that he can hardly still have been on active duties (cf. Holleaux's comment, quoted above, p. 143; and cf. Tarn, JHS, 53, 1933, p. 67).

[16] Delays amounting to years were assumed by Ferguson, Ath. Trib. Cyc., pp. 128 ff., in regard to the Leukophryena (and thence, by extension, to the Delphian Soteria), but Robert, REA, 38, 1936, pp. 11 ff., showed, in criticism of Ferguson, that such delays could probably all be explained on the two grounds indicated; see further Dinsmoor, Archon List, pp. 117–119.

NOTES ON THE BIOGRAPHY OF ST. EDMUND OF ABINGDON

J. C. RUSSELL

University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

A recent book on St. Edmund makes remarkable advances in the knowledge of this outstanding saint and scholar.[1] The author, C. H. Lawrence, has sifted the mass of evidence produced by Edmund's canonization and reduced it to an understandable corpus, identifying the authorship of some pieces and tracing their relationships. He has edited much of this evidence so that it is now accessible for use. Edmund's biography stands out somewhat clearer. It was known, of course, that Edmund came of a borough family, had a long period of study and teaching in arts and theology before he came into prominence as Treasurer of Salisbury and Archbishop of Canterbury. The author shows that Edmund's family was really rich in children and property, that Edmund deserves more credit for more effective political leadership than he has received and that, at the end of his life, he was merely making a routine trip to Rome rather than retiring into exile at Pontigny. Further clarification of Edmund's life is possible within the limits of the evidence without conjecturing unreasonably.

The data derived from the process of canonization emphasize primarily those qualities and miracles which indicated that Edmund was a candidate for sainthood, leaving unfortunate gaps in the evidence about the course of his life. The letter of postulation from the University of Oxford speaks of Edmund's long association there as student and master, but gives only one statement of time, that he ruled in arts six years. And it does not indicate, what is known elsewhere, that he studied both arts and theology at Paris.[2] The letter from the Bishop of Salisbury says that he was a member of the chapter there but does not give the

[1] St. Edmund of Abingdon. A Study in Hagiography and History, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1960.

[2] Lawrence, pp. 290–293.

office.[3] Although Matthew Paris writes about Edmund's family, he fails to give the name of the brother who was at Eynsham and apparently omits at least one other.[4] Given the erratic character of the evidence one uses the argument from silence only with care.

From many documents it is known that Edmund was Treasurer of Salisbury from 1222 to 1233 and Archbishop of Canterbury from 1233 to 1240. Earlier than these periods the chronology of his life is very uncertain. It has been thought generally that the year he spent at Merton Priory was 1213–1214, although he had evidently expected to teach (at Oxford) then.[5] That year can hardly be defined as an interruption of his teaching at Oxford, since the suspension of the schools there lasted from 1209 to 1214. More probably he returned to England in the summer of 1213, expecting to teach at Oxford. This was a reasonable expectation since King John came to terms with Pope Innocent III on May 13, 1213. Normally the lifting of the Interdict and the reopening of the University would have followed shortly. However, the University did not open until the following year: the negotiations which led to convening of the University were finished on July 2, 1214.[6]

The letter of postulation from Merton Priory might at first sight seem to reflect conditions of the Interdict. In a sentence relating intimately Edmund's life there only private devotions are mentioned: [7] such as were permitted in religious houses during the Interdict. In contrast other letters tend to emphasize his preaching for which he was famous.[8] However, this may be merely an accident. Edmund periodically shared in the religious life of monasteries even during the years in which he was Treasurer of Salisbury. This was an appropriate way to spend a forced vacation from academic life. Since he spent somewhat more than a

[3] Lawrence, pp. 293–295.

[4] Lawrence, pp. 222–223.

[5] "Dum lecturiens apud Mertonam." Matthew Paris, in Lawrence, p. 234. See also Lawrence, pp. 119–120.

[6] H. Rashdall, The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages, revised by A. B. Emden and F. M. Powicke (Oxford, 1936), III, 34–35: the document is given in H. E. Salter, Medieval Archives of the University of Oxford, I, 2–4.

[7] "Erat enim in lectionibus et meditacionibus assiduus, in oratione devotissimus, semper in ieiuniis et vigiliis continuus, horam nullam matutinarum dormiendo preteriens sed ad omnes, nobiscum quasi deditus esset, accedens." Lawrence, p. 297.

[8] Lawrence, pp. 293–302.

year there,[9] it would presumably be from the end of the school session at Paris (June–July, 1213) to the opening of Oxford in the autumn of 1214.

The Merton letter says that Edmund stayed there before he was public rector of theology.[10] This has been taken to mean just that he was professor of theology, equating it with the more usual term *regens* in theology or *lector* of theology.[11] However, rector is an unusual word to use for this alone. It usually meant the chief clergyman of a parish or the head of some ruling group.[12] Academically it had a variety of meaning. The head of the University of Bologna had that title. At Oxford, about the time of this letter, the proctors of a faculty were called rectors.[13] It seems likely, then, that the style, *rector theologie*, applied to Robert Bacon in the Oxford letter, meant "proctor" of theology rather than regent, especially since he is known to have had official duties at the time.[14] Thus, if possible, the term should be related to some executive responsibility of Edmund in addition to the teaching post.

Actually the "rector of the Schools" seems to have been the head of Oxford at the time Edmund was at Merton, a kind of term used in transition. Earlier, in 1201, a Master John Grim, a theologian appears with the title, "Master of the Schools."[15] This was a very common term employed by many schools. It was not surprising that the rising university wished a more impressive title. Probably in 1209 Robert Grosseteste was trying to get it

[9] Lawrence, p. 297.

[10] "Nam idem venerabilis pater antequam theologie publicus rector existeret, per annum et amplius in domo nostro iugiter morabitur." Lawrence, pp. 297, 207, 230–231.

[11] As Eustace indicated: "In quo tam mirabiliter in brevi profecit quod cito post paucos annos, suadentibus multis cum instancia, cathedram magistralem quasi invitus, quamquam doctus amore iustiticie et veritatis, ascendit." Lawrence, p. 197. But why justice if only a professor's chair?

[12] No use of it as a professorial chair is indicated in DuCange, Glossarium.

[13] Rashdall, III, 58. That is, a kind of faculty head.

[14] "Videlicet frater Robertus Bacun, rector in theologia Oxonie, et frater Ricardus de Drinstapele, prior Fratrum Predicatorum ibidem." Lawrence, p. 292. For Robert's activities see my Dictionary of Writers of Thirteenth Century England, pp. 130–131. He is never given a title in the documents.

[15] Called such in Historical Manuscripts Commission, Manuscripts of . . . the Duke of Rutland, IV, 82: "theologiam Oxon' legentes" (with another master). Eynsham Cartulary, ed. H. E. Salter (Oxford, 1908, Oxford Hist. Soc.), II, 45–47.

changed.[16] Then in 1210 a Master Alard appears as "Rector of the Schools."[17] The Legatine Ordinance of 1214 reforming the University of Oxford permitted the Bishop of Lincoln to name a chancellor.[18] If Edmund, at the request of many, went to Oxford in 1213 to be public rector of theology, he may have become the first chancellor in 1214.[19] Not much is known of the early chancellors, but Ralph Maidstone, who left Paris in the Dispersion of 1229, was already chancellor of Oxford in 1231.[20] Of course this suggestion that Edmund was the first chancellor raises the question: why has no one mentioned it? Probably it is an accident that no reference to it has survived, assuming it to be true.

The tradition that the first chancellor of Oxford was Robert Grosseteste is undocumented and may well be questioned on other grounds.[21] Edmund, it may be noticed, was well liked by several concerned with the University leadership at the time. Hugh, Bishop of Lincoln, was brother of Joscelin, Bishop of Bath, who later wrote a letter in regard to Edmund's canonization: both brothers were in France during most of the Interdict, as was Edmund. Hugh had been a royal clerk before the Interdict. King John, by being patron of the Church of St. Mary the Great, Oxford, where much of the academic life centered was deeply concerned with the schools.[22] He was also patron of St. Peters-in-the-East, where Edmund built a Lady Chapel some years earlier.[23] The King's Chancellor, Walter Gray, had been

[16] See my "Notes on the Career of Robert Grosseteste, "Harvard Theological Review, XLVIII (1955), 202.

[17] Rashdall, III, 39.

[18] Rashdall, III, 37.

[19] Lawrence, pp. 234, 291. See note 11 above. The chancellor was usually a professor of theology.

[20] My Dictionary of Writers of Thirteenth Century England (London, 1936), p. 110.

[21] The tradition is accepted by D. A. Callus, Robert Grosseteste, Scholar and Bishop (Oxford, 1955), pp. xv, 7–10. Russell, "Notes," p. 202. If my interpretation of the evidence is correct Grosseteste was in France in this period, closely associated with King Philip Augustus.

[22] Russell, "The Early Schools of Oxford and Cambridge," The Historian, v (1943), 70–71.

[23] On royal patronage of St. Peters see Rotuli Roberti Grosseteste, episcopi Lincolniensis ((Horncastle, 1914, Lincoln Record Society), 445, 449, 450. See also note 51.

a student of Edmund and had a tremendous admiration for him.[24] Walter's uncle was the powerful bishop of Norwich, very close to King John. Richard Poore, dean of Salisbury and a professor at Paris, who later invited Edmund to be Treasurer of Salisbury, was frequently at court, while Alexander Neckam, a former professor of theology at Oxford was a close friend of the king.[25] Archbishop Stephen Langton also had great respect for him. All of these men seem to have been in England in the spring of 1213 when John surrendered to Innocent III and when the choice of the rector of Oxford was probably made. And Edmund was an ideal intermediary between the King and the University in a very difficult time.

If Edmund finished his course in theology at Paris in 1213 or a year or so earlier (assuming he had to teach a necessary regency), he taught theology at Oxford eight years before he became Treasurer of Salisbury, a period defined as "aliquot annis" by one writer.[26] Shortly after this (1215) Cardinal Robert Curzon, in charge of revising the regulations of the University of Paris, set thirty-five as the minimum age for securing the doctorate of theology there.[27] This was probably the custom in use then. If Edmund was thirty-five in 1213 he would have been born about 1178. In this period of teaching he is described as *iuvenis* (young),[28] rather flattering for one of 35–43 years, although Isidore in his well-known Etymologies allowed youth (*iuventus*) to run from 28 to 50 years.[29] The usual period for studying theology was long, but it often included time when the student was busy at other tasks as well. Edmund was said to have finished quickly,[30] but even his study may have been interrupted by his holding of benefices, since he is said to have declined to hold any *in absentia*.[31]

[24] Lawrence, pp. 112–116.

[25] For Neckam see Russell, Dictionary of Writers of Thirteenth Century England (London, 1936), pp. 14–16. He was also buried near King John in Worcester Cathedral.

[26] Lawrence, p. 234.

[27] Rashdall, I, 472.

[28] "Et etate iuvenis quosque senes fidem, doctrina, scientia et consilio excedebat." Lawrence, p. 231.

[29] Isidore, XI, ii, 1–8. See also my Late Ancient and Medieval Population, p. 33.

[30] See note 11.

[31] As Lawrence suggests, p. 198.

He was a master ruling in arts at Oxford for six years.[32] During this period[33] he commenced sleeping off of his bed, a practice which he followed for "thirty years" according to Bishop Joscelin of Bath and for "thirty-six years" according to Robert of Dunstable and Matthew Paris.[34] What did such terms mean to people of that time in actual years? In general the tendency was to understate terms of years, in contrast to the usual medieval exaggeration of numbers.[35] Edmund was said by the Bishop of Salisbury to have been there for almost ten years, but actually it was eleven.[36] The descriptive terms used in the Inquisitions *post mortem* can in many cases be checked against quite accurate evidence of age. Thus in fifty-seven cases where "thirty years" was given, the average age was thirty-four.[37] In four cases of "thirty-five" the average was 39.5 but eight cases of "thirty-six" showed an average of 36.5. So apparently thirty and thirty-five were regarded as round numbers while thirty-six was considered a definite number. Thus actually thirty and thirty-six were not far apart and probably do indicate just about thirty-six and more years, that is, to his death from the end of the period of teaching. The latter then probably fell close to the years 1198–1204.

An earlier period, i.e., 1195–1201, has been suggested by Lawrence on the grounds that, if Edmund was the first to teach the Sophistici Elenchi at Oxford, it must have been before 1200 and that Walter Gray must have studied with Edmund earlier also.[38] So little is known of what was taught then or even of the accuracy of Roger Bacon's statements that little can be based upon this assertion.[39] Walter Gray was named Chancellor of England in 1205, evidently through the influence of his uncle, John, Bishop

[32] Lawrence, p. 291 (Oxford letter).

[33] The expression "a tempore quo rexerat in artibus" may be assumed to mean any time in the whole period rather than when he incepted or commenced his teaching. Lawrence, p. 292.

[34] Lawrence, pp. 114–115, 205, 228. Lawrence's skepticism about the numbers seems unnecessary. After all, Edmund's brother (pp. 203–205) passed on this statement.

[35] For such exaggeration see my Late Ancient and Medieval Population, p. 46.

[36] Lawrence, p. 294.

[37] My British Medieval Population, p. 110.

[38] Lawrence, pp. 112–116.

[39] Lawrence, p. 113. Daniel of Morley went to Northampton and possibly Cambridge rather than Oxford. See my "Notes," p. 201; Dictionary of Writers of Thirteenth Century England, p. 25.

of Norwich. Since Walter received no degree, nothing is known of his age or status. Quite mature persons often attended the schools, so the fact that Walter was mature enough to be named chancellor in 1205 indicates little about the time he studied with Edmund. It seems then that the references to Edmund's religious practices offer more certain indications about the years when he taught arts at Oxford.

Edmund, according to our hypothesis, began teaching arts at Oxford about 1198, presumably after finishing at Paris then or a year earlier.[40] His stay at Paris was probably a minimum of three or four years. He and his brother, Robert, went to Oxford for about seven years when they "already seemed to excel their masters in the art of grammar."[41] It seems very unlikely that this high praise would be applied to boys under the age of sixteen or seventeen. Probably Edmund was at Oxford from about ten to seventeen and finished the equivalent of a bachelor's degree. Since he was so brilliant intellectually, he probably finished the M.A. work at about twenty, the minimum set by Robert Curzon some years later.[42] This would mean that he was at Paris about 1194–1195 to 1198 or thereabouts. Again if he was about twenty or twenty-one in 1198 he would have been born about 1177–1178 which is near the date suggested by figuring back from the time of his theological degree.

It has been suggested that Edmund "was so young when his father (Reginald) died that he could not remember him."[43] One may well doubt this. Edmund was apparently the oldest child of a "fair sized family," as Lawrence shows.[44] He had two sisters who were sent to the Nunnery of Catesby, and besides Robert, two brothers, Nicholas and Edward(?) who went respectively to Boxley and to Eynsham. A William, son of Reginald, gave lands to Catesby and was apparently another brother.[45] The

[40] Assuming again a necessary regency of a year or so.

[41] A. B. Emden, An Oxford Hall in Medieval Times (Oxford, 1927), p. 87, quoting from a manuscript at St. Johns, Cambridge. He was twelve while at Oxford. Lawrence, pp. 83, 224.

[42] Rashdall, I, 462.

[43] Eynsham Cartulary, II, 269, probably derived from Matthew Paris' statement, "Patre post paucos annos defuncto." Lawrence, p. 223.

[44] Lawrence, p. 106. The evidence is not clear, but the responsibilities placed upon him suggest it.

[45] Lawrence, p. 317.

grant was witnessed by a Roger, son of Reginald, possibly another brother.[46] Six children certainly and possibly eight emerge from this evidence. A family with that many children living for a number of years is likely to have lost some in infancy or early childhood. Thus from the birth of Edmund until the birth of the last of the children there must have passed twelve to fifteen years. After all, Reginald needed some time to acquire the wealth from which he derived his name, Rich.

During the twelve to fifteen years from about 1177 to 1189–1192 the children should have been born. Since Mabel was a widow before Edmund and Robert left for Paris about 1194–1195, Reginald would have died in the period 1189–1193. Now one source says that Reginald entered the monastery of Eynsham before he died, but this has been doubted because the Eynsham letter did not mention it.[47] There are two reasons which suggest that Reginald might have entered some monastery other than Abingdon or Eynsham. The first is that Mabel's husband, like her children, must have been under heavy pressure to enter religion. The second is that there is no hint of any burial at Abingdon, explicable if he was buried in a monastic cemetery.[48]

Mabel was buried in the cemetery of Abingdon Abbey and later moved to a new chapel dedicated to the Holy Cross, St. Edmund and St. Guthlac: this chapel, according to one source, came to be called the Chapel of Edmund's Mother.[49] Since this burial place was primarily for employees of the Abbey, Mabel's burial there suggested to Lawrence that Reginald was one.[50] Fortunately there are two lists of abbey servants of the years 1185–1189, when presumably Reginald was still alive. Two Reginalds

[46] However, Roger's name, if that of a brother of the grantor, should have been followed by the words, "ejus fratre." Reginald was more than usually popular as a man's name in Abingdon because an abbot had borne that name.

[47] Lawrence, pp. 106–107. The story was that he had his wife's consent which, given the character of Mabel, is probably an understatement.

[48] This is an argument from silence, but a man of Reginald's wealth was apt to have left a record of donation.

[49] (Abbas Johannes de Blostmeville) in capella que dedicata est in honorem sancti Crucis et beatorum Edmundi et Guthlaci confessorum, quam ipse abbas propriis sumptibus fabricavit; et quia Mabilia mater sancti Edmundi ibidem iacet tumulata, capella matris sancti Edmundi vulgariter nuncupatur." English Historical Review, XXVI (1911), 731.

[50] Lawrence, pp. 109–110.

are mentioned: one, a Reginald Kiwel,[51] a cook who, given Edmund's indifference to food, was probably not his father. The second was in charge of the drains (*guterii*) which carried water from the roofs.[52] This Reginald was thus a tinner, plumber or even stonecutter since the gutters might be of any of these materials.[53] For this he had the income of 9½ acres of land, a loaf of bread a day and a hog at Christmas. His responsibility required great skill and involved danger but it was a part time position. He probably found much demand for his work in nearby Oxford. That he acquired wealth is easy to understand.

Even while she was alive Mabel had a reputation as a saintly person.[54] She practiced extreme austerities, the most publicized was the wearing of an iron corselet (*loricam*) next to her skin. It is not surprising that she encouraged Edmund to fast at an early age and sent him hair shirts to wear when he was away at school.[55] And after she died, her apparition telling him to study theology was sufficient to send him to this discipline.[56] She not only sent both Edmund and Robert away to the University of Paris before she died, but she made arrangements with Edmund for both daughters to enter nunneries, leaving the choice to Edmund. All of this is well known. Since she died while Edmund was still studying at Paris, it must have been earlier than 1198. If Edmund was the oldest and not yet 21, they were all minor children. Since the brothers were not at home then,[57] probably Robert was in Paris and the two who entered monasteries already there. The two sisters were presumably in Abingdon, but this leaves unsettled the question of the location of William and Roger,

[51] Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon (London, 1858, Rolls Series), II, 237–244, 296–334: Reginald Kiwel on p. 238.

[52] "Reginaldus habebat i. panem in aula, pro guteriis parandis. Sep. ejus, uno anno v. acras, et alio iiii. acras et dimidiam, de decima in Appelford, et i. porcum in Natali." Ibid., II, 241.

[53] Just after telling how Edmund began to wear the iron lorica worn by his mother, after her death, Robert Banon says that at certain times of year he wore a lead garment. Was this in remembrance of his father? "Cum autem Oxoniam devenisset, mortua matre sua, ipsa uti lorica, quam ad hoc reliquerat ei mater sua, (incepit), que in vita sua eadem utebatur. Uti etiam solitus fuit in Adventu Domini et in Quadragesima quodam indumento plumbeo." Lawrence, p. 249.

[54] Lawrence, pp. 195, 203, 223, 290–291.

[55] Lawrence, pp. 195, 223, 291.

[56] Lawrence, pp. 69, 206–207, 229, 291.

[57] Lawrence, p. 106.

assuming them brothers.[58] It looks a little as if Mabel was using religious houses as orphan homes. But it is possible that relatives were caring for the children elsewhere. In any case Mabel exerted a powerful influence upon the family.

Reginald could also have influenced at least the older boys since he probably lived until they were in their early teens. Furthermore he also was quite religious. If Reginald was the skilled workman in charge of the Abingdon Abbey drains, he was associated with builders and craftsmen, and his wealth was apparently in houses. Was Edmund also interested in such? Even as a master of arts at Oxford he built a Lady Chapel, probably on St. Peter's-in-the-East which is still there.[59] He apparently accepted a wealthy prebend from Archbishop Walter of York with the understanding that he would use the money to enlarge and repair the church.[60] As Treasurer of Salisbury he was in charge of ornaments, bells and candles: [61] his friend, Elias of Dereham was in charge of the rising cathedral.[62] When Archbishop of Canterbury, Edmund granted an indult, a relaxation of forty days penance to contributors to the Salisbury Fabric Fund.[63] With Elias he examined a site for a new secular cathedral, a project which had to be abandoned.[64] These would seem to indicate a considerable interest in building.

Of course, it may be said that many churchmen of the period were builders of various degrees of enthusiasm without the benefit of a father who was engaged in construction. Furthermore church repair at the time was popular because of the activity along that line by St. Francis of Assisi, probably the most popular saint of that period. Yet other saintly men of early thirteenth century England: Stephen Langton, Richard Wich, Roger Niger and Robert Grosseteste did not share this enthusiasm. Only

[58] Presumably Edmund, not yet having his M.A. was under 21 when he arranged for one charter (Lawrence, pp. 316–317) and probably William and Roger were younger (Lawrence, p. 317). It raises the question of the legal age for children in the English boroughs of the time.

[59] A. B. Emden, An Oxford Hall, pp. 88–93; Lawrence, pp. 206, 229, 291.

[60] Lawrence, pp. 77, 253.

[61] Register of St. Osmund (Rolls Series), I, 8–13. This does not indicate, as Lawrence, p. 123 suggests, that the treasurer was in charge of the fabric.

[62] My "Many Sided Career of Master Elias of Dereham," Speculum, V (1930), 381.

[63] Historical Manuscripts Commission, Various Collections, I, 377–378.

[64] Lawrence, pp. 166–167: Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury, II, 174.

Richard Poore exhibits such an interest and he had a serious problem, location of his church within the fort at Old Sarum, which only the building of a new cathedral would solve. Edmund's interest in building thus does seem rather unusual within his group of saintly associates. Even this interest was subordinate to his enthusiasm for charity. At one time he was in arrears in his payments for the fabric fund at Salisbury[65] and from another statement it is known that he spent time at Stanley Abbey [66] while Treasurer at Salisbury because he had given away his salary.

His attitude toward possession of sources of revenue may also have come from his father who was said to have been generous.[67] He was not an admirer of Lady Poverty to the point where he would give away his possessions. To use a modern term he believed in the "stewardship of wealth." This is well illustrated by a story told by Odo of Cheriton, a professor at Paris and a well known author. Edmund gave a rich benefice to his brother, Roger, and said, when he was asked whether this gift might not endanger his brother, that such benefices should be given to men like his brother.[68] He was quite willing to receive money if he could perform the services involved even though the very popular Saint Francis at this time was exemplifying the virtue of poverty.

Furthermore, phases of the careers of both Robert and Edmund indicate resistance to Mabel's drive toward monasticism and asceticism. Robert, if the documents bearing his name after 1210 refer to him, was interested in legal business, was slow in getting his M.A. degree and never attained a reputation for preaching. He was evidently a fine, able man about whom only a mild odor of sanctity arose.[69] Edmund postponed entering holy orders until after he became a master of arts.[70] His deep interest in geometry apparently evoked a voice of conscience. Although he

[65] Register of St. Osmund's II, 65; Lawrence, p. 123.

[66] Lawrence, p. 123.

[67] "Exitur igitur Abendonie oriundus parentibus Christianissimis moribus honestis, operibus bonis et elemosinis plenis." Lawrence, p. 295. Lawrence makes the suggestion that the sources avoided referring to Reginald's profession because he was in business, an employment hardly worthy of the father of a great saint. Lawrence, p. 110.

[68] J. T. Welter, Thesaurus Exemplorum, V, 12.

[69] Lawrence, pp. 144–146; my Dictionary of Writers of Thirteenth Century England, pp. 128–129.

[70] Lawrence, pp. 196, 206.

wandered in and out of several religious houses (Merton, Abingdon, Reading, Pontigny, Stanley) and even told the pope that he would like to be a monk,[71] he somehow resisted the urge (or perhaps the vision of his mother). This resistance may well have been in part the result of the influence of a good father who did well in his profession. And Edmund's career possibly might be defined as a compromise between the urge of an ascetic, possessive mother and a normal hard-working father.[72]

The value of the evidence in this study varies considerably. The seven years study and six years of teaching arts at Oxford seem safe to believe. The thirty or thirty-six years can be explained to give a fairly definite meaning: the number of children in Edmund's family and the number of years which Reginald lived after Edmund's birth less so. The ages at which Edmund attained his degrees in arts and theology are estimated at the minimum because of Edmund's intelligence. The most reassuring factor is that they seem to present a fairly coherent picture of Edmund's life. Most conjectural are the possibilities that Edmund was head of the University of Oxford in 1214 and that his father was an artisan and influenced his life more than is generally believed. There is still the chance that unknown documents may reappear which will clear up these problems. With the information made available by Lawrence, St. Edmund seems a more interesting and less simple character than even his early biographers portrayed.

[71] Perhaps because geometry was sometimes regarded as akin to magic. Lawrence, pp. 251–252.

[72] Lawrence, p. 129.

ECUMENICAL RELATIONS BETWEEN BOSTON PURITANISM AND GERMAN PIETISM: COTTON MATHER AND AUGUST HERMANN FRANCKE*

ERNST BENZ

Marburg/Lahn, Germany

May I begin with a personal introduction to the theme of this evening's lecture, the encounter between continental pietism and New England Puritanism? I began teaching Church history at the Martin Luther University in Halle-Wittenberg in 1932. There I had the opportunity to study the archives of August Hermann Francke, in the old library of Francke's orphanage. These archives were in a state of highly inspiring disorder, for there were chances of all kinds of unforeseen discoveries, both in the many boxes containing Francke's correspondence and on the shelves holding all the books sent to this head of pietism by his friends all over the world. At first, I studied his correspondence with ministers, scholars, bishops and generals in Russia and the Baltics, publishing an article about Francke in Russia.[1] Then I came across some boxes which held an enormous mass of material connected with New England, letters to German ministers and German communities in Pennsylvania, diaries of emigrants, together with letters in English from Puritan theologians and New England missionaries. I was especially interested in Francke's correspondence with Cotton Mather.[2]

After the war I came into contact with a different part of Francke's literary estate. Some boxes of relevant materials be-

* This paper was originally presented before the faculties of the Harvard Divinity and Episcopal Theological Schools on March 22, 1960.

[1] Ernst Benz, "August Hermann Francke und die deutschen evangelischen Gemeinden in Russland," Auslandsdeutschtum und Evangelische Kirche, 1936, 143–192.

[2] Earlier studies, all by Kuno Francke, are: "Cotton Mather and August Hermann Francke," [Harvard] Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature, V (1896), 57–67; "Further Documents Concerning Cotton Mather and August Hermann Francke," Americana Germanica, I — iv (1897), 31–66; and "The Beginning of Cotton Mather's Correspondence with August Hermann Francke," Philological Quarterly, V — iii (1926), [193]–195.

See also Thomas James Holmes, Cotton Mather: A Bibliography of His Works, in Three Volumes (Cambridge, 1940), III, 1358.

longing to the manuscript collection of the Berliner Staatsbibliothek had been moved from Berlin to Hesse during the war; afterward, they came to Marburg, where I was able to study them in 1948 and 1949. In 1950, at the London archives of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, I consulted the other half of the correspondence between Francke and his English friends, as well as papers relating to the English translations and editions of the writings of Francke and the pietist missionaries. Having received a personal impression of the activities of this London group, which was the connecting link between German pietism and New England Puritanism, I condensed my findings, compared them with the fragments previously known to me, and combined them into a general picture.[3] This evening I do not want to take you into the details and historical development of the correspondence between Francke and Mather, but rather to point out some major concepts illustrating the historical significance of this contact between continental and American Protestant Church history as a whole.

This contact between New England Puritanism and continental pietism was made possible by the unusual ecumenical situation in London during the first two decades of the eighteenth century. The prince consort of Queen Anne was the Lutheran prince, George of Denmark. He had the privilege of having his own Lutheran court preacher, and St. James Chapel in Buckingham Palace was given over to the Lutheran form of worship. Difficulties with his first court preacher, a theologian of the very strict orthodox tradition of Wittenberg, caused Prince George to replace him with a pietist preacher personally recommended by Francke, Anton Wilhelm Boehm.[4]

Boehm became the center of an extremely active ecumenical movement in England. On the one hand, he maintained warm, personal contact with the authorities of the Anglican Church. St. James Chapel was still under the jurisdiction of the Anglican

[3] Ernst Benz, "The Pietist and Puritan Sources of Early Protestant World Missions" (Mather and Francke), Church History, XX — ii (1951), 28–55.

[4] Even today, there is no major study of Boehm. Some notes about him appear in J. Rieger's "The British Crown and the German Churches," which is in the volume edited by Franz Hildebrand, And Other Pastors of Thy Flock: A German Tribute to the Bishop of Chichester (Cambridge, 1942), 101 ff.

bishop of London, and the Lutheran services held there made use of the German translation of the Anglican Book of Common Prayer. On the other hand, Boehm was quite intimate with the leading men of both the free church movement and independent Puritan groups in England, e.g., the Wesleys, as well as some Quakers, Presbyterians, Congregationalists and Baptists. Intensely interested in the problem of Christian unity, Boehm was well acquainted with the continental, English and American aspects of the problem.

Boehm came to exert an even stronger influence, because he spoke and wrote in English very well. Becoming the leading figure in the S.P.C.K.,[5] he not only introduced his ecumenical endeavors into this very active and powerful organization, but also translated the relevant ecumenical writings from German into English, from English into German, and from Latin into both vernacular tongues. It was Boehm who regularly turned the reports and letters of August Hermann Francke into English; it was Boehm who selected German pietist writings for English consumption and who usually did the translations; and it was Boehm who supplied the prefaces, introductions, and outlines for English readers. For example, he translated Johann Arndt's Four Books of True Christianity into both Latin and English,[6] thereby

[5] William O. B. Allen and Edmund McClure say little about these events in their Two Hundred Years: The History of the S.P.C.K. (London, 1898).

[6] I have used the 1720 London edition of Arndt's Four Books of True Christianity in this lecture. The broad influence of Arndt upon English and American Protestantism should receive special attention; it goes back to the following editions of his writings:

A) the Latin edition (London, 1708) entitled Verus Christianismus;

B) several English editions, including:

i) A Short Instruction Concerning the Principles of True Christianity, both as to the Fall of Man and his Restauration by Jesus Christ (London, 1709);

ii) Of True Christianity (London: I, 1712; II, 1714); second edition in two volumes (London, 1720);

iii) The Garden of Paradise: or, Holy Prayers and Exercises; Whereby the Christian Graces and Virtues may be planted and improved in Man, the divine Image renew'd, true Christianity promoted, the Kingdom of God established, and a heavenly Life raised up on the Spirit. Pursuing the Design of the famous Treatise of TRUE CHRISTIANITY. By John Arndt, Sometime Superintendent General in the Dutchy of Luneburgh. Now done into English from the German Original (London, 1716).

Editions ii and iii were translated by A. W. Boehm, and are to be understood, as Boehm says in his preface to The Garden of Paradise (pp. iv–v), as "a Sort of a *Spiritual Library*, for such as are either not able to purchase vast and various Books, or not willing to run through large and voluminous Composures." Boehm goes on

contributing to the widespread influence of this leading book of the German pietist revival movement. It was Boehm, moreover, who translated letters and reports from British and New England theologians into Latin, so that Francke might use them. By his death in 1725, Anton Wilhelm Boehm had become the clearing-house for the entire global correspondence of Francke and the other German pietists, connecting the Boston Puritans with Halle and with the pietist missionaries in Tranquebar, and connecting Halle with South India and South Africa. It is impossible to understand the world-wide extension of the pietist movement, the contact between New England Puritanism and continental pietism, or the connection between Protestant missions in "East India" (= India) and "West India" (= America), without a knowledge of the myriad activities of this Lutheran court preacher of St. James in London.

I

The first result of that direct encounter between continental pietism and American Puritanism was its influence upon the religious self-consciousness and self-interpretation of both sides. Until that time, the established churches of the continent and the Puritan churches of New England had viewed each other with suspicion. The European established churches considered the communities on American soil to be more or less schismatic and heretical. The German territorial churches in particular inter-

---

to warmly recommend Arndt's writings because they "do happily keep the *Middle-way*, betwixt *False Enthusiasm*, and *False Naturalism*, the two great and dangerous Rocks so many do split upon in these latter Days" (p. v). In his preface to the 1720 edition of True Christianity, Boehm writes regarding Arndt:

> One of the greatest Efforts of this Divine was, to remove from Christianity the abominable Idol of a mere *external Formality* (commonly called *Opus Operatum*:) and to inspire People with an *inward Sense* of all the Duties and Functions they did outwardly perform. He would have 'em not only maintain the Purity of the Doctrine, but adorn also a pure Doctrine with a suitable Purity of Life and Manners; counting this the noblest Ornament, the Crown and Topstone of a true *Reformation*, to which all other Endeavours ought directly to tend. [P. xviii.]

Cotton Mather, in his "nuncia bona" of 1715 (see below), speaks admiringly of

> . . . what the Holy *John Arndt*, about an Hundred Years ago, in his Treatise of *True Christianity*, inculcated on the loose Christians of his Age; (a Treatise of Mighty Use among them at *this time*, and long since Bless'd for the Conversion of Millions of Souls. . . ." [Pp. 11–12.]

preted America as the country of escape, because it admitted all those heretical groups which, having offended ecclesiastical and civil laws relating to religion, withdrew from legal prosecution by fleeing across the ocean. On the other hand, it appeared to the American churches that the European churches were falling into a condition of total decay. Thus, the dark picture of the decay of the medieval Roman Catholic Church characteristic of the writings of Luther, Calvin and the Scottish Reformers was extended to the churches of the Reformation by the American Puritans. As against that general decline and corruption of both the Roman church and the established churches of the Reformation, the New England churches understood themselves to be based upon a new covenant, distinguished by a new spreading of the Holy Spirit, and entrusted with a new and divine task of building up a new plantation of Christ in the wilderness.

With the advent of German pietism, for the first time the churches of New England came into contact with a spiritual revival movement among the Protestant established churches of Europe. This movement accepted the Puritan critique of traditional continental church life as superficial and of the churches themselves as decadent, and agreed with the Puritans that the true reformation of the Church had not been brought to completion by the Reformers of the sixteenth century. Like Puritanism, this movement considered its mission to be that of bringing the reformation of the Church to completion and perfection by means of a spiritual and ethical revival. Thus it was that Puritans in New England and pietists on the continent discovered allies on the opposite side of the ocean — which, until then, generally had been understood as the enemy's side.

Francke's first reports concerning the different kinds of pietist activity on the continent gave Boston Puritans a very impressive picture of this new attitude. The English translation (London, 1707) of Francke's report is entitled Pietas Hallensis: or, an Abstract of the Marvellous Footsteps of Divine Providence, in the Building of a very large Hospital, or rather, a Spacious College, for Charitable and Excellent Uses. . . .[7] Convinced that God is

[7] Pietas Hallensis was extremely important in the spreading of pietism throughout the Anglo-Saxon world. It was reprinted several times in English, each time

still working in His old powerful way in His Church in spite of all the corruption and decay, Francke produces as evidence ("footsteps of divine providence") the building of the Waisenhaus and other enterprises of Christian charity in Halle. The report is prefaced with a statement by Bishop Josiah Woodward concerning

> *those* Four Noble and Blessed Designs *now, thro' the Goodness of God, happily advancing among us. Namely*;
> *The* Suppression *of Scandalous* Impiety and Vice.
> *The pious* Instruction *of* Youth *and* ignorant Families.
> *The* Cultivation *of Religion by* pious Conference.
> *And the* Propagation *of the Christian* Faith *among* Infidels.
> *To all which excellent Undertakings, it is exceedingly to be wisht, that one more may be added: to wit, vigorous Endeavours for* Protestant Union.

Thus the New England Puritans became aware of the surprising fact that the continental churches had finally accepted a program of reformation which they could consider as being identical with their own. Thereafter, there was a marked change in their attitude toward continental Protestantism and in the style of discussion.

Replying in 1717 to Francke's report, Cotton Mather begins his letter with a surprising apologia; he defends the American churches and American Christianity against all kinds of older continental prejudice (one might say, against an anti-American ecclesiology, by which the continental established churches were

---

being brought up to date, and often under different titles. Thus, the London edition of 1787 appeared as The Footsteps of Divine Providence, or, The Bountiful Hand of Heaven defraying the Expenses of Faith: Wonderfully displayed in erecting and managing the Hospital at Glaucha without Halle in the Prussian Dominions, for the Education of Students in Divinity, and for the Reception, Cloathing, Feeding, and Educating of Poor Children. Carried on by the Instrumentality of the humble and blessed Servant of God, Augustus Hermannus Francke.

The title of the first German edition is, in itself, an introduction to the theological background of this basic document of pietist social ethics: Segens = volle Fussstapfen des noch lebenden und waltenden liebreichen und getreuen Gottes, Zur Beschämung des Unglaubens und Stärckung des Glaubens entdecket durch eine wahrhafte und umständliche Nachricht von dem Wäysen-Hause und übrigen Anstalten zu Glauche vor Halle, welche Im Jahr 1701 zum Druck befördert, jetzo aber zum dritten mal ediret, und bis auf gegenwärtiges Jahr fortgesetzet, von August Hermann Francken, S. Theol. Prof. und Past. Halle, in Verlegung des Wäysen-Hauses, MDCCIX.

wont to express their feelings toward the groups of Christian nonconformists and independents migrating to America). "We Americans here live beyond ultima Thule, in a country which was unknown to both Strabo and Caesar, but not unknown to Christ." This was a point of widespread controversy in the century following the great discoveries, for certain continental theologians said: America is outside of the knowledge and interest of Christ. This concept of America as "unknown to Christ" was connected with an eschatological interpretation of Matthew 25:30 where it is written concerning the worthless servant (the Parable of the Talents): "Cast the worthless servant into the outer darkness; there men will weep and gnash their teeth."

Mather sharply refutes the continental interpretation which identified "the outer darkness" with America and "the worthless servant" with the emigrating independents exiled by the established churches of the continent. He charges that this interpretation of St. Matthew is *frivolum somnium*, "a frivolous and indecent dream unworthy of serious consideration." Nevertheless, Mather did take this argument seriously as early as 1700 when, writing the general introduction to his Magnalia Christi Americana, he set forth his own theology of the new covenant and of the new plantation in the wilderness:

> Upon that Expression in the Sacred Scripture, *Cast the unprofitable servant into Outer Darkness*, it hath been imagined by some, That the *Regiones Exterae* of *America*, are the *Tenebrae Exteriores*, which the *Unprofitable* are there condemned unto. No doubt, the Authors of those Ecclesiastical Impositions and Severities, which drove the English Christians into the *Dark Regions of America*, esteemed those *Christians* to be a very *unprofitable* sort of *Creatures*.[8]

[8] Magnalia Christi Americana: or, The Ecclesiastical History of New-England, from Its First Planting in the Year 1620. unto the Year of our Lord, 1698 (London, 1702), 3 ("A General Introduction"). The two-volume edition published at Hartford in 1820, I, 26.

The theme of the "obscure America" may also be found in Mather's publication of Francke's report on pietist activities at Halle, Nuncia Bona e Terra Longinqua. A Brief Account of Some Good and Great Things A Doing For the Kingdom of GOD, In the Midst of Europe. Communicated in a letter to ——— From Cotton Mather, D.D. & F.R.S. (Boston, 1715). This letter begins:

> Sir. Such is the *Candor* to be found in Persons of a Superior Character on the other side of the wide Atlantick, that they will admit us obscure *Americans* into *Correspondencies* with them; from which our *Information* of such Things, as are most worthy to be Known, and perhaps also our *Opportunities to do Good* in

Mather's counterinterpretation, given in the Magnalia Christi Americana of 1702 and in the letter of 1717, differs in one very interesting point from the traditional European understanding. In the Magnalia, he says:

> But behold, ye *European* Churches, There are *Golden Candlesticks* [more than *twice Seven times Seven*!] in the midst of this *Outer Darkness*: Unto the *upright* Children of *Abraham*, here hath arisen *Light in Darkness*. And let us humbly speak it, it shall be *Profitable* for you to consider the *Light*, which from the midst of this *Outer Darkness*, is now to be Darted over unto the other side of the *Atlantick Ocean*.

In the letter to Francke, Mather says:

> But into these outer regions the salutary, blessing light of the Gospel did finally penetrate. The sun of righteousness and of blessedness arose. This is the work of God, and is a miracle to our eyes as well as to all believers.

Then he gives a detailed picture of the New England churches which certainly is far more idealized than the traditional picture, depicted by the continental churches in the darkest colors. Admitting, he continues, that there is nothing perfect on this earth, it can still be said that "in the present depraved and deplorable state of this impure world (*mundus immundus*), there is not to be found a place in which true and genuine Christianity is more cultivated than here in New England." If St. Bernard understands the bride of the Song of Songs to represent the Church, and if he calls her the most beautiful among women (*pulcherrima inter mulieres*), then fair-minded judges must admit that the American churches deserve the prize for beauty. (We discover here that even American beauty contests have a Puritan background and that, in a sense, St. Bernard is responsible for this!)

---

the World, may be very much befriended, and Enlarged. One as Worthy of Obscurity, as any of them, that ly hid a thousand Leagues of the Westward of *Thyle*, has had so much Experience of this *Candor*, that he cannot forbear imparting some Effects of it, unto a Person, in whom I am sure to find *it* again exemplifyed.

Here one feels that self-conscious irony which has been the charming supplement to Puritan gravity in American literature, and which even so rigid a Puritan as Cotton Mather could not avoid using.

Mather proceeds to describe the faith and constitution, and the different kinds of activity of the American churches. But if, as we have noted, he emphasizes in the Magnalia the fact that the continental churches have much to learn from the new planting of Christianity in America, in his letter to Francke he also stresses that the light of the revival of true Christianity in Europe has radiated across the ocean and kindled light in America. Both sides become conscious of their congruity, and the new light of American Puritanism flows together with the light of continental pietism, strengthening their common endeavor.

With this beginning of the soteriological self-understanding of the American churches, another problem emerges which may be called "the theological meaning of East and West." In the tradition of the Old Church, the West has always been understood as the direction of the Antichrist. During the baptismal liturgy (which is still valid throughout the Eastern Orthodox Church today), the catechumen first has to be turned toward the West, where he recites the formula of renunciation of the Devil in the West, and spits three times westward. Then the priest turns him from West to East, and the catechumen, having broken with the Devil, recites the Creed as an oath and self-dedication to his new Lord, Jesus Christ, and thus faces and adores this "Light from the East." Not only was this soteriological understanding of East and West fixed in the minds of medieval European Christians who were well acquainted with St. Jerome's formula ("We must renounce him who is in the West."); it was still alive among German pietist groups at the beginning of the nineteenth century, the era of the European wars of liberty against Napoleon. Napoleon, representing the spirit of French rationalism and materialism, was interpreted as the Antichrist from the West by all the adherents of the revival movement (*Erweckungsbewegung*) in Germany, Switzerland and Russia. Many revivalist groups emigrated from Southern Germany and Switzerland to Russia, in order to escape the Western Antichrist and find a refuge (Solyma) in the East.[9]

It is quite understandable that Cotton Mather, with his soterio-

[9] Ernst Benz, "Ost und West in der christlichen Geschichtsanschauung," Die Welt als Geschichte, VI (1935), 488–513.

logical interpretation of America's Christian churches as "the light upon the candlesticks" illuminating not only the darkness of the American continent but also degenerate European Christianity, should polemicize against the traditional concept which linked the geographical West with the Devil. In a sermon dealing with the missionary activities of German pietism, he argues:

> It was an odd Ceremony and Superstition in some ancient *Baptisms*, that when they *Renounced Satan*, they turned their Faces to the *West*, where the Sun sets in *Darkness*; But Professing their Faith in our SAVIOUR, they turned their Faces to the *East*, the *Region* where *Light* arises. We have now seen the *Sun Rising in the West*; A Forlorn People in the *Western* World now said, *Thro' the Tender-Mercy of our GOD, the Day-Spring from on high has Visited us*.[10]

While some European theologians mistakenly understand the "Outer Darkness" of Matthew 25:30 and 22:13 as soteriological allusions to the western continent of America, the missionary activity of the Puritans has transformed the darkness of America into the light of "Pure Religion" and "True Christianity." Mather continues:

> And now, tho' ELIOT, and those that follow'd him, in the *First Essays*, to bring the *Light* unto the Nations, that were doomed unto *Outward Darkness*, be Dead, yet there has been a Succession of worthy Englishmen, who have *gone on* with the Essays; And there are *Indians* also, who are constant Preachers of the Gospel unto their Countrymen; so that the *Good Work* having *Obtained Help from GOD*, and having triumphed over the Plots of Ill affected Men to divert from it the *European* Waters that nourish it, it *continues to this Day*.
>
> The Work is *Glorious*: But a Principal *Glory* of it, has been the *Purity* of the CHRISTIANITY, which has been brought unto these *Indians*, in our Attempts to *Christianize* them . . . [being not] the *Religion of a Party*; but the *Pure Religion and Undefiled*, which is evidently contained in the *Sacred Scriptures*.

Thus, the controversies among Christian "parties," typical of the decay of European Christianity, are brought to an end on American soil by "Pure Religion." American soteriology changes

[10] "The Joyful Sound," 32–33. See footnote 25, below, and related section of this lecture.

the traditional formula of "Light from the East" to a new one, "Light from the West."

This novel concept finds expression not only in the theological self-interpretation of pietism and Puritanism, but also in their understanding of Church history. Cotton Mather's concept of American Church history is based on the idea of the decay and collapse of the continental Reformation. He frequently remarks that on the continent and especially in England "the progress of the desired reformation had been stopped, so that the Christians who tried to reestablish true Christianity, were persecuted." The special task of the New England churches is to "prosecute an Evangelical Reformation," to "attain a perfect reformation," to "advance the true reformation," and to "produce a fuller and better reformation of the church of God." This attitude toward reformation, always opposed by the established churches of the continent, Mather now finds to be identical with the attitude of the continental pietists. Thus, Anton Wilhelm Boehm's English translation (1707) of Pietas Hallensis includes "A Short Account of Some Persons who have been Instrumental in promoting the most Substantial Points of RELIGION in some Parts of GERMANY [and] Whose Proceedings some have endeavoured of late to render Odious by the new-invented Name of Pietism." This history of continental pietism begins with the idea of the decay of the churches of the Reformation:

> Such hath been the tender Care of Divine Providence for the good of Souls at all times, even when Religion was at the lowest Ebb, and Ignorance and Impiety was become almost universal, as to appear, by raising up some eminent Persons who boldly gave their Testimony against the Vices of the Age, and Corruptions of the Church. But as these noble Attempts have constantly met with great Opposition from the Prince of Darkness, who is always busying himself, to frustrate the intended good Effects thereof, so the Power of God hath been rendred the more Conspicuous by the Oppositions of the Enemy, thus defeated by the Wisdom of the Lord. But since Christianity hath been so unhappily Rent into many Sects and Parties . . ., it would be an Attempt far more noble in it self, and more useful for reviving a Spirit of real Piety in others, if every Church did trace out the *Brighter Instances* of such Persons, as have been made Instrumental to keep up

> the Life of Religion, when the greatest part busied themselves with Strifes and Disputes.[11]

Then Boehm describes Johann Arndt and the so-called orthodox reformers, the forerunners of Spener, Francke and the later pietists, showing how Arndt and his contemporaries introduced a new concept of practical piety into the established system of confessional controversial theology.

Boehm also sets forth this new concept of Church history in the preface to his translation of Arndt's Four Books of True Christianity. Picturing in minute detail the history of the Reformation up to the time of the pietist movement, Boehm (a Lutheran minister belonging to the continental Lutheran Church) presents the first critique in English of the continental Reformation. He pays special attention to the concept of faith and justification (pp. xvii–xix), setting forth the idea of justification as expressed in the writings of the young Luther. Then Boehm shows how that basic concept was misinterpreted by Luther's pupils. According to Boehm, Luther himself was involved in this development which falsified the original meaning of faith, neglecting the practical side of piety and emphasizing more and more formal doctrine and intellectual knowledge. Boehm writes (pp. xxxiv–xxxv):

> After the Death of *Luther* . . ., it was expected, the *Protestants* . . . should have carried the Work raised by *Luther*, and his Fellow-Labourers, to a higher Perfection. . . . But alas! Things fell out quite otherwise. Hardly had *Luther* got his Quietus, when too many of his Friends lost more and more the *Main Design* out of their Eye. Strifes and Contentions, Disputes and Clamours, grew to an excessive Height; but the plain Practice of Piety fell to Decay.

Then Boehm proves that it was Johann Arndt who first became conscious of the need to promote a better reformation, and to bring the halfway Reformation up to the standard of true Christianity (pp. xviii ff.).

[11] Boehm continues in this "Short Account" (which, it may be noted, was also published independently of Pietas Hallensis) on p. 4:

> This present *Narrative* may present the Reader with some few Instances both of the *Difficulties* some Zealous Persons have lately encountred with, and of the *Success* they have obtained in their Endeavours to revive, in some degree, the Practice of real and substantial Religion, and to shew the difference betwixt an outside formal Profession of Godliness and the vital Power of true Virtue and Piety.

II

Here we come upon the second major point in this encounter of Puritanism and pietism, viz., the ecumenical emphasis of their theology and practice. Continental pietism was a reaction against the confessional controversies on the continent which, by killing in the name of Christ during the religious wars of the seventeenth century, had reduced the population of Germany from thirty million at the start of the wars to three million at the end of the wars, and had destroyed cities, towns and villages, changing the country into a wilderness. Pietism aimed at emphasizing the practical side of Christian devotion, in order to arrive at a better understanding among the opposing Protestant parties and churches (not to mention the Roman Catholics) of the continent. Thus we find a general tendency toward church union among the early pietists. This ecumenical outlook corresponded to a similar tendency in New England, and was one of the main reasons for the deepening of the friendship between continental and "American pietists" (as Cotton Mather calls the New England Puritans in his letters to Francke).

I have already noted that Bishop Woodward recommended the English translation of Pietas Hallensis (1707) to his readers by saying that to the four noble and blessed aims of the pietist endeavor one more may be added, viz., "*vigorous Endeavours for* Protestant Union." Anton Wilhelm Boehm similarly recommends the 1712 English translation of Arndt to Queen Anne by stressing his propagating of church union and by prophesying:

> There will be a Time, when the Church of Christ will *come up from the Wilderness* of various Sects, Parties, Nations, Languages, Forms, and Ways of Worship, nay of Crosses and Afflictions, *leaning upon her Beloved*, and in his Power bidding Defiance to all her Enemies. Then shall that Church, which now doth but look forth as the Morning in its first Dawn, after a continual Growth in Strength and Beauty, appear *Terrible as an Army with Banners*; but terrible to those only that despised her whilst she was in her Minority, and would not have her Beloved to reign over them.[12]

[12] "Preface" to Of True Christianity, I, p. xiv.

In his English "history of pietism,"[13] Boehm describes the setting and achievements of pietism thus far:

> The spirit of contention and Bitterness, of Strife and Envy, of Pride and Passion, of Sect and Partiality, having all along cover'd it self with the fair and specious name of orthodoxy of pure doctrine, of primitive church and worship, and with other such fond and swelling titles, and judging all such as were not of its peculiar mode and form, begins to be stript from its vain and shining attire, and to be exposed in its own black and odious colours. The unhappy names of Distinction into Lutheranism, Calvinism and other humane Parties, begin to lose their Credit with some, and Christ begins to be more preached up, as the great and only restorer of fallen nature.

It is understandable, then, that Cotton Mather, in writing to Francke, first mentions church union and church unity as typical of New England's ecclesiastical life. Francke and the London pietists had sent him Arndt's writings as both representative of "true Christianity" and as providing the primitivist basis for common understanding among all Christians. Mather therefore not only describes the coöperation practiced among the New England churches, but also attempts to outline an ecumenical theology, becoming thereby the first American forerunner of Walter Horton. Obviously, Mather paints an overly idealistic picture of church unity in New England, but that may be understood and forgiven; he is attempting to portray it as the "fairest among women," and so some "make-up" should be allowed.

Mather says that among the American churches, the only condition for mutual communion is union with Christ.

> Whoever is united with Christ, is admitted to all communities without any restriction. Thus the American churches kindly admit the adherents of all the different denominations to their communion and Eucharist, and grant them all ecclesiastical privileges.[14]

Quite evidently, Mather is not describing a state which has already reached full realization, but rather a process in formation. He continues:

[13] Propagation of the Gospel in the East, part III, London, 1714, p. v.

[14] In his first letter (Francke, Nachlass Schachtel, 32, Nr. 47, Blatt 280, Corresp. H. Dr. Cottoni Matheri in Boston, Prof. Theologiae, 1717, in America).

> There are Calvinists who admit Lutherans, Presbyterians who admit Episcopalians, Paedobaptists who admit Antipaedobaptists, whenever the light of sincere piety gleams among them.

Mather does not say that everybody admits everybody else, but he claims that there is an advance toward unity on different denominational levels and among different groups, all on the basis of "true Christianity."

Then Mather condenses his own understanding of this concept of "true Christianity" into the fourteen principles of the Eternal Gospel (*Evangelium Aeternum*). The idea of the *Evangelium Aeternum* is a very old revolutionary and eschatological principle, elaborated in the thirteenth century by Joachim of Fiore and then converted into a revolutionary program by the radical wing of the Franciscans, who were fighting the feudal institutions of the medieval Roman Catholic Church.[15] This concept not only reappears in the Hussite reformation in Bohemia; it also finds expression among the "left wing" reformers of sixteenth century Germany. The *Evangelium Aeternum* is frequently connected with violent revolutionary movements, e.g., Thomas Müntzer, some of the Anabaptists, and certain radicals of the English revolution. Pietists as well as Puritans interpreted the Eternal Gospel in a primitive eschatological sense, understanding their own period as the historical fulfillment of Revelation 14:6–7:

> Then I saw another angel flying in midheaven, with an eternal gospel to proclaim to those who dwell on earth, to every nation and tribe and tongue and people; and he said with a loud voice, "Fear God and give him glory, for the hour of his judgment has come; and worship him who made heaven and earth, the sea and the fountains of water."

[15] The concept of the *Evangelium Aeternum* seems to be connected with a special tradition of missionary theology, no doubt directly with Eliot. There is an earlier pamphlet from Mather's pen, entitled: The Everlasting Gospel. The Gospel of Justification By the Righteousness of God: As 'tis Held and Preach'd in the Churches of New-England: Expressed in a Brief DISCOURSE on that Important Article; Made at Boston in the Year, 1699 (Boston, 1700). In this discourse, the Eternal Gospel is identified (as the title indicates) with the doctrine of justification. I did not discover any allusion to his later concept of the "Maxims of the Eternal Gospel" being the foundation of a missionary (as well as ecumenical) theology. On the other hand, the three "Maxims of the Everlasting Gospel" printed in "Notitia Indiarum" (see Section IV of this lecture) are connected with a full translation in the Indian language, and may belong to an earlier missionary tradition, possibly worked out by Eliot himself.

On the side of the German pietists, this prophecy has been connected in a special way with the person and writings of Johann Arndt. In the historical interpretation of Apocalypse given in 1743 by the leading pietist of Württemburg, Johann Albrecht Bengel, Arndt is understood as the historical fulfillment of this prophecy, he being the angel and his Four Books of True Christianity being the Eternal Gospel.[16]

I cannot detail here all fourteen of Mather's principles of the *Evangelium Aeternum*, but it should be remarked that he condenses the whole of Christian ethics into the so-called Golden Rule: Whatever you wish that men would do to you, do so to them. One point which I cannot omit is Mather's demonstration of the practical value of such a short, condensed program of "true Christianity." He would proceed by working out an agreement on the substantial points of Christianity that would be acceptable to the several embattled Christian fraternities. Assuming that agreement on less important questions would easily follow, the result of this program would be true union among all Christians. Mather is thoroughly convinced that his fourteen principles contain the true essence of Christianity, and are therefore capable of establishing unity among the different denominations. Comparing these denominations with beehives, he remarks that we often observe tremendous battles between bees of different hives. But we cannot discover the cause of the fighting because the bees on both sides are of the same size, type, color, and fight with the same weapons while making the same sound. Scholars have discovered that the only distinction among bees is their smell or scent. If someone were to spray the same perfume on both the fighting armies of bees, they would lose any sense of difference and cease fighting. Mather's fourteen principles of the Eternal Gospel are meant to be just such a perfume, removing the distinctive smells of the different Christian beehives.

I think this image is worth introducing into the modern ecumenical discussion. Evidently it is much more realistic to start the ecumenical problem with the concept of denominational smell than to begin with denominational theology.

[16] Ernst Benz, "Verheissung und Erfüllung: Über die theologischen Grundlagen des deutschen Geschichtsbewusstseins," Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, LIV (1936), 520 ff. and 529 ff.

III

Inasmuch as Harvard Divinity School has a chair of Eastern Church History, it should be added that Cotton Mather appears to have been the first American Puritan to include the Eastern Orthodox Church in his ecumenical considerations. Indeed, he was the first American theologian to publish a book about the Greek Church. This is particularly interesting, for the continental pietists (in connection with their ecumenical efforts) were the first Protestant theologians to study the Greek and Russian Orthodox Churches. Without going into details, I may simply mention that August Hermann Francke founded an Oriental Institute for the study of the modern Greek, Slavonic, Russian, Arab and Syrian languages. Many mystical and devotional books (e.g., Arndt's Of True Christianity) were translated into Russian, Greek and Arabic at Halle (and printed there, too). Numerous Russian and Greek Orthodox theologians studied at Halle during those years, while Francke himself maintained direct contact with Orthodox leaders in Russia. Some ecumenical sympathizers like Heinrich Wilhelm Ludolf were well acquainted with leading bishops and theologians in Greece, Constantinople, Jerusalem, Cairo, Egypt and Abyssinia (Ludolf being a master of the languages of all these countries).[17]

Cotton Mather joined in this pietist interest in the modern Greek Church, studying many of the older and newer Protestant writings about these eastern churches. Mather's book, published

[17] See Ernst Benz in footnote 1 of "Verheissung und Erfüllung . . .," and Eduard Winter, Halle als Ausgangspunkt der deutschen Russlandkunde im 18. Jahrhundert (Berlin, 1953), pp. 32 ff. and index heading, "H. W. Ludolf." Heinrich Wilhelm Ludolf, an illustrious scholar of oriental languages like his brother Hiob, was from 1686 secretary of Prince George of Denmark, and from 1700 a member of the S.P.C.K. after his return from the Near East and Egypt. Cf. also Ernst Benz, A. H. Francke und die deutschen evangelischen Gemeinden in Russland, in Auslandsdeutschtum und evangel. Kirche, Jb. 1936 S. 150 ff. H. W. Ludolf also published the first grammar in vernacular Russian, with ecumenical conversations of a Protestant with an orthodox Russian. Cf. J. S. G. Simmons, H. W. Ludolf and the Printing of his Grammatica Russica at Oxford in 1696, Oxford Slavonic Papers t. 1, Oxford, 1950, 104 ff.

For the relations between German pietism and the Eastern Orthodox Church, see Ernst Benz, "Die Ostkirche im Lichte der protestantischen Geschichtsschreibung von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart," Orbis Academicus, III — 1 (Munich, 1952), Part II, 64–115, and bibliographical notes, 402–405.

at Boston in 1701, reveals in its long title his particular concern with this subject: American Tears upon the Ruines of the Greek Churches. A Compendious, but Entertaining HISTORY of the Darkness come upon the Greek Churches, in Europe and Asia. Composed by an American and Published, Partly to bespeak a more frequent Remembrance of those (once) Famous Churches, in the Prayers of the Faithful afar off. And, Partly, to Suggest unto Other Churches, the Advice and Warning to be thence taken, that their Candlestick, may not be Removed out of its Place. With, An Appendix containing a Relation of the CONVERSION of a JEW, Named, Shalome Ben Shalomoh.[18] There must have been some general curiosity about the contemporary state of the Greek Church, for Mather says in his preface:

> One of the Honorable *JUDGES* of *New England* laid his Commands on me, to give the Publick, a True and a Brief Representation, of the Miseries, under which the Greek Churches (and Millions of *Christians* in them) at this day are Languishing. He thought, it would Glorify our Lord *JESUS CHRIST*, and Satisfy and Edify very many of His People in *our Churches*, and admonish them of some Great *Christian Duties*, too little thought upon for us to have the Astonishing Dispensations of Heaven, towards the *Golden Candlesticks* of the East, thus Represented unto us.

Thus, Mather connects his description of the modern Greek Church with an historical interpretation of the Apocalypse, identifying as fulfilled some of St. John's prophecies of afflictions to accompany the ending of the world.

Mather's American Tears is characterized by a feeling of brotherly love, compassion, and a sense of responsibility not only to help these eastern churches but also to challenge the forces of decay which ruined them and which (in different guise) threaten the New England churches. His eschatological understanding of the history of the Greek Church (especially in regard to its severe persecutions) explains Mather's connecting this topic with the tale of a Jew converted to Christianity in Boston. The re-establishment of the eastern churches in the last days will be followed

[18] I have found copies of this rare book in Harvard's Houghton Library and in the Congregational Library, 14 Beacon Street, Boston.

by the conversion of the Jews, the final step in the history of salvation before the second coming of Christ.

For Cotton Mather, the Greek Church is more than merely a means of calling the churches outside the Turkish Empire to repentance; he praises her positive contribution to the development of learning in the West, particularly in connection with the Reformation:

> I will add, That very much of the *Learning*, wherewith we are now advantaged, is much owing, partly to the *Calamity*, and partly to the *Ingenuity* of the Greek Churches. Incredible Darkness was upon the Western parts of *Europe*, two Hundred years ago: *Learning* was wholly swallowed up in *Barbarity*. But when the *Turks* made their Descent so far upon the Greek Churches as to drive all before them, very many Learned Greeks, with their Manuscripts, and Monuments, fled into *Italy*, and other parts of *Europe*. This occasioned the Revival of Letters there, which prepared the World for the *Reformation* of *Religion* too; and the *Advances of the Sciences* ever since. [American Tears, pp. 42–43.]

IV

Here we touch upon the last problem I want to mention this evening as regards the connection between continental pietism and Boston Puritanism, viz., the problem of Protestant foreign missions. Kenneth Scott Latourette has pioneered in explaining the puzzling fact that the churches of the Reformation did not develop any feeling of missionary responsibility during more than two hundred years, while all that time the Roman Catholic Church not only extended its missionary activity throughout Asia, Africa and America, but also developed its chief missionary institutions (the *Congregatio de propaganda fide*, the seminary for propagating the faith, and numerous new monastic orders entrusted with missionary tasks).[19] It is not possible to describe here all the reasons for the astonishing lack of missionary activity on the Protestant side. Suffice to say that it was furthered in Protestant orthodoxy by a kind of antimissionary theology, based on learned biblical and theological arguments, which held that the task of world missions had been completed by the apostles, so that for

[19] Kenneth Scott Latourette, A History of the Expansion of Christianity, III: Three Centuries of Advance, A.D. 1500–1800 (New York & London, 1939), 24 ff.

Protestants to engage in such activity would be superfluous and useless.

As a matter of fact, only with pietism did there arise among Protestants a consciousness of missionary responsibility, connected with the simple idea that each Christian must be a missionary and apostle of Christ, and must preach Christ by example as well as by words. I cannot recite in detail here the varied missionary activities initiated and carried out by the German pietists, by Zinzendorf and the Moravians, or by Francke's pupils, Ziegenbalg and Plütschow, who in 1706 were sent by the King of Denmark to the East Indian Danish colony at Tranquebar in South India.[20] For now, the point which interests us is the fact that in the Francke-Mather correspondence we find the first attempts to develop a theology of missions and to understand missions as a global task involving all Protestant churches. Previous to that correspondence, the mission of the New England churches to American Indian tribes and the pietist mission in East India proceeded without either side knowing of the other's activities. When the reports of the Tranquebar mission, both as set down by the German missionaries and translated into English and published in London by the S.P.C.K. and as described in Francke's letter to Mather, reached New England, they awakened enormous interest and stimulated a warm exchange of ideas on the meaning and task of Protestant missions. For example, in a long letter written to Mather in 1714,[21] Francke says:

> I have in my Hands a Letter, dated at *Boston July* 12, 1687, and writ by one *Crescentius* [Increase] *Mather*, to *John Leusden*, heretofore a famous Philologer at *Utrecht* in *Holland*. I suppose the Writer to be one of your Relations. In this Letter he mentions one *John Eliot*, and his unwearied Labours, in spreading Christian Knowledge among the Heathens there. He speaks likewise of some entire Congregations, made up of such Persons as were gained over to our Holy Religion by the Diligence of that Labourer. All which I have read with singular Satisfaction, and wish to be fuller inform'd of the present State of all such Endeavours as have a Tendency that Way.

[20] See Arno Lehmann, Es begann in Tranquebar — Die Geschichte der ersten evangelischen Mission in Indien (Berlin, 1955; second edition, 1956).

[21] Francke's letter to Mather was printed in Pietas Hallensis, 57 ff. of Part III (London, 1716). See footnote 7, above.

This is the very first mention on the continent of the American mission to the Indians in New England and of Eliot's name.[22] Then Francke gives a detailed report of the Tranquebar mission, describing the difficulties and the progress of this pietist activity. He suggests that Mather write directly to the East India missionaries:

> I do not doubt, but it would be very agreeable to our Missionaries, if a Letter from your Hand did give 'em a full Account of all such *Methods* as hitherto have been made use of for converting your *West-India* Heathens to the Christian Faith. And I heartily wish, that the like Account may also be imparted to us, with the first Opportunity.

Encouraged by these few lines, Cotton Mather wrote to Ziegenbalg at Tranquebar, and so doing, became the author both of the first American ecumenical theology and of the first American missionary theology.[23] Mather first gives an emphatic picture of the high significance of a missionary's ministry, which he considers as truly angelic work. But even more important is his expression of the idea that the lack of missionary activity is one of the main faults of Protestantism and one of the most scandalous signs of decay among churches of the Reformation. A forerunner of Latourette, he compares the lack of Protestant missionary activity with Roman Catholicism's world mission:

[22] In "The Joyful Sound," 29–30 (see footnote 25, below, and related section of this lecture), Cotton Mather praises Eliot's work in these words:

> . . . our celebrated ELIOT . . . Visited the Villages of these *Indians*, and with a very discrete Management Preached the *Word of Truth and the Gospel of their Salvation*, in their own Language unto them. This Memorable Servant of GOD, was no sooner at work, but in some other Parts of the Country, the *Harvest* had some other Labourers appearing in it, who *did vertuously*; but no One is *wronged*, if it be confessed, that our ELIOT shone as the *Moon among the Lesser Stars*, and *Excelled them all*. This *Good Man* had the *Hand of the Lord* with him; & his Evangelical Attempts were so blessed of GOD, that anon (beyond what any *Xavier* could pretend unto!) *Churches* were formed among these *Indians*, and in an *Holy Covenant* they *gave themselves unto the LORD, and then unto one another*, Engaging to Live in the Service of GOD, and carry on together the Worship of our SAVIOUR, according to the Directions of the Gospel.

[23] At Halle, I have discovered the originals of this letter, written on Dec. 31, 1715, and of its English translation (made by Boehm). The letter is printed in the second half of India Christiana, subtitled "Notitia Indiarum," 62–74 (see footnote 25, below, and related section of this lecture); the excerpts cited follow the pagination of this printed version.

> Great and Grievous and never enough to be bewailed, has been the Scandal given in the Churches of the Reformation; in that so very little, yea, next to nothing, has been done in them, for the Propagation of a *Faith*, which breathes nothing but the most unexceptional Wisdom and Goodness; and by which the Kingdom of GOD comes down into a World, which Satan Reigning every where in it, Possesses and Oppresses, with how direful Chains of his upon it! While at the same time, the Church of *Rome*, strives with an Unwearied and Extravagant Labour, to Propagate the Idolatry and Superstition of *Antichrist*, and advance the Empire of Satan. And the Missionaries and Brokers of that Harlot, are indeed more than can be numbred. The Zeal of those Panders, how Ardent is it! Their Attempts, how never tired! Their Travels how very tedious! And with what an Ardour are they Ambitious of *a Crown*, which appears to them a True Martyrdom, & for the Truth!
>
> But Blessed be the Name of our GOD, in that He hath inclined the Minds of some Eminent Persons, to take away such a Scandal, and instigated them to roll off this Reproach from us. And among these, if any *have done vertuously*, You, O *Malabarian* Missionaries . . ., *You have excelled them all.* [Pp. 64–65.]

Turning to his own theology of missions, Mather expounds his conception of the Eternal Gospel, understood in the eschatological sense of the term. Christian missionaries, he holds, above all should avoid transferring the traditional controversial theology of their denominations into the mission fields of non-Christian countries. (We find this same idea quite independently of Mather in Zinzendorf, with respect to the latter's missionary activity among the Negroes of Santa Cruz and among the Indians of New England.) [24] The Indians do not have to be converted into Lutherans or Presbyterians, but only into true Christians; therefore, they should be given only the true essence of the Gospel. Mather writes:

[24] Ernst Benz, "Zinzendorf in Amerika," in E. Benz and H. Renckewitz, Zinzendorf-Gedenkbuch (Stuttgart, 1951), 140–161; and in the same volume, E. Benz, "Zinzendorfs ökumenische Bedeutung," 118–139, especially p. 130: "Die Heidenboten sollen den Heiden die Kirchen 'nicht wieder aufputzen' und sollen vermeiden, 'neue Nebensekten zu machen' and 'neue Samariterkirchen zu errichten.'"

In Ruth Rouse and Stephen C. Neill's History of the Ecumenical Movement, 1517–1948 (London, 1954), Kenneth Scott Latourette entitles his contribution: "Ecumenical Bearings of the Missionary Movement." These "bearings" go back to the earliest Protestant missionary activity in Puritan New England as well as to early eighteenth century German pietism.

> . . . in the *First* Place, this is the very *First-born* of my Wishes . . .: That all the Servants of GOD, who *Do and Endure* many Things for the Evangelizing of the World, may Exhibit unto the whole World the *Pure Maxims* of the *Everlasting Gospel*, and would Preach unto the Nations, the *Weightier Matters of the Gospel*, and the *Wheat* well cleansed from the *Chaff*, and from those *Lesser Matters*, whereabout Good Men, may and often do, carry on their Disputations.
> Tis most certain, that the *Christian Religion* . . . is a *Practical Thing* rather than a meer *Theory*; the Intention whereof is, to animate a Real, Solid, Vital PIETY, and Call forth such as ly *dead* in their Sins, unto a *Godly*, & a *Sober*, & a *Righteous* Life. [P. 66.]

For the assistance of non-Christian peoples outside the intellectual tradition of Europe, he condenses his fourteen points of the Eternal Gospel into three points, viz., (a) the article on God, subsisting in three persons, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, (b) the article on Christ, our redeemer, and (c) the article of love, that

> . . . Being filled with the Love of GOD and of CHRIST, we must most Heartily Love our *Neighbours*; and for ever go by that Golden Rule, Whatsover you would have Men do unto you, do you even the same unto them. This is that PURE CHRISTIANITY, which when it shall be by the Trumpets of GOD purely and plainly Preached unto the Nations, the Preachers will doubtless have GOD smiling upon them . . . . [P. 68.]

Mather's reduction of the *Evangelium Aeternum* to three points was not an abstract program of missionary theology, but was directly connected with Puritan missionary activity among the Indian tribes of New England. We must remember that the original seal of Massachusetts (in Mather's words) was "a Poor Indian having a Label from his Lips, expressing this Cry, COME OVER AND HELP US!" This seal was patterned on Paul's vision in Acts 16:9, where a man of Macedonia appears to him in the night, saying: "Come over to Macedonia and help us." The same missionary aim found expression in Massachusetts' first charter which declared

> The winning and inciting of the Natives of the Country unto the Knowledge and Obedience of the only True GOD, and SAVIOUR of

> Mankind, and the Christian Faith, to be a principal End of the Plantation.[25]

Cotton Mather set forth his own theological understanding of Christian missions in India Christiana (Boston, 1721), a pamphlet containing documents both of the Puritan mission in New England (among the natives of "West India") and of the pietist mission (among the inhabitants of the Coromandel coast in "East India"). Connecting as it does the global missionary activity of the Protestant churches of Europe and America, this is an impressive document of the ecumenical consciousness of Boston Puritanism, as the title of the first section (a sermon) proves, viz., "The Joyful Sound reaching to both the INDIA's." This work merits careful study, because it contains one of the earliest expressions of that missionary self-consciousness of American Christianity which has influenced so deeply the historical self-understanding of the American people. After dedicating his work to Robert Ashhurst, governor of the "Corporation for Propagating the Gospel in New-England, and Parts adjacent in America," Mather prints the text of his address ("The Joyful Sound") delivered before the commissioners of this society on January 18, 1720, "A Time Set apart for Supplications to Heaven for a Blessing on their Intention, at the House of Judge SEWALL." Emphatically praising missionary responsibility and work, he sets forth some considerations on the origin of the "Aboriginal Natives of the *Good Land*, which the GOD, *whose is the Earth and the Fulness thereof*, has bestow'd upon us" (p. 22). The biblical promise, "I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession" (Psalm 2:8), seems to have been one of the fundamental arguments in the soteriological self-understanding of the New England Puritans, the "uttermost parts" being interpreted as a prophetic allusion to the American continent. This promise includes the obligation to engage in practical missionary service among the Indians and "may have a very Illustrious and Conspicuous Accomplishment,

[25] Cotton Mather cites these facts in the work referred to in my footnotes 10 and 22 as "The Joyful Sound," p. 27. As my lecture will next indicate, "The Joyful Sound" and "Notitia Indiarum" are sections one and two of Mather's India Christiana (Boston, 1721).

in the Arrival of our INDIANS unto the Knowledge & Service of our Great REDEEMER" (p. 23).

Mather sharply refutes those conjectures which would deny the human nature and qualities of the natives of America. "Let a foolish *Paracelsus*[26] and *Peyrerius* pretend what they will, we are sure, that the *Americans* are of the *Noetic Original*" (p. 23). The American aboriginals, like the men of Asia, belong to the type of man who is created in the image of God. Mather accepts the theory of Acosta and Brierwood that "*Asia* and *America* are Contiguous," together with Bochart's theory that those "great Sailors," the Phoenicians, "either Intentionally or Accidentally" brought people "over the *Atlantic* into *America*" (p. 23). He takes note of other hypotheses about the origin of the American Indians, e.g., the theory of an unidentified "learned Englishman" who has interpreted America as a reservation, in which Satan long ago hid these people, so that the light of the Gospel might never reach them. However, this understanding of America as "the Seat of them that shall *Think an evil Thought*" only prompts Mather to call for stronger missionary efforts: "The *Deceiver of the Nations* has been *Deceived*, if this were his Expectation; and that he may be more so, is that for which we now are Labouring" (p. 24). He then turns to the theory of an unnamed "German Scholar" who has claimed that

> . . . *America* was not Peopled until after the Preaching of the Gospel in the *other Hemisphere*, when GOD for their contempt of it, Ordered their coming hither as into a *Banishment*, where they that would not

[26] In his original works Paracelsus never talks about the inferior nature of the aboriginal Americans. On the contrary he expresses a quite opposite meaning, considering the Americans as natural "children of eternal bliss," whose special happiness consists in the matter of fact that they never were infected with the "vermin" of the Roman dogma. In an appendix to his early sketches to the commentary to St. Matthew he writes: "wie selig sind die inseln des meers, darin der rattensamen (the doctrines of the Roman church) nicht kommen ist. das sind die inseln der nackenden leute. die wissen nichts umb euren betrug. die irrung, die sie haben, die wäschet ihnen der regen hinweg. und seindt kinder der ewigen seligkeit. besser wäre es, dass der, der sie find und sie bekleidet mit den unsern sitten, des galeere wäre steinen und fiele mit ihnen gen boden. lernen Christum kennen und neben dem alle büberei; vergessen Christum wieder und gebrauchen das ander." (Extract in modern orthography in Paracelsus, Vom Licht der Natur und des Geistes. Eine Auswahl., von Kurt Goldammer; Stuttgart (Reclam) 1960, 170 f. Cf. Kurt Goldammer, Aus den Anfängen evangelischen Missionsdenkens. Kirche, Amt und Mission bei Paracelsus, in Ev. Missions-Zeitschrift IV, 1943, 64–66.)

be *Saints*, do now almost cease to be *Men*: A Sentence of *Transportation into America* was by Heaven passed upon them.

Mather does not accept this interpretation of America as a penal settlement for those post-Christian pagans who refused to accept the Gospel, however. "We may leave it unto a *Maebius* to Dispute it with them" (p. 25). He categorically rejects the idea that the Gospel reached America at the time of the apostles; and he denies to the mission of the Spaniards among the Indians the character of a true conversion to Christianity, their "boasted Conversion of the Pagans" being "little other than a *Change of Idolatries*." For Mather, the genuine Christian mission on the American continent began only with the Puritans. "This *Good Work*, O New-England, thou hast the Honour of making the *First*, Right, Fair and Genuine *Beginning* . . ." (p. 27).

But this is only the theoretical side of the problem. He considers the practical aspect of the Christian mission among the "poor Indians" to be that of transforming them from "animals" into "men." For Mather, Christianization is identical with the processes of civilizing and humanizing. Despite his attack on "Paracelsus and Peyrerius" for having denied that the American aboriginals belong to the "Noetic Original," Mather falls back on a similar concept, saying:

> The desolate *Indians*, that survived the Mortal Contagion, which had newly and strangely swept away such Multitudes, as to make some Room for the *European* VINE that was Transplanting hither, were the most forlorn *Ruins of Mankind*, and very doleful Objects. Their way of living was lamentably Barbarous. Beyond all Expression Dark were their Notions of a God . . . . Tho' they saw a People Arrive among them, who were Clothed in Habits of much more Comfort & Splendour, than what there was to be seen in the *Rough Skins* with which they hardly covered themselves; and who had *Houses full of Good Things*, vastly out-shining their squalid and dark *Wigwams*; And they saw this People Replenishing their *Fields*, with *Trees* and with *Grains*, and useful *Animals*, which until now they had been wholly Strangers to; yet they did not seem touch'd in the least, with any *Ambition* to come to such Desireable Circumstances, or with any *Curiousity* to enquire after the *Religion* that was attended with them. To *Humanize* these Miserable *Animals*, and in any measure to *Cicu-*

rate them & *Civilize* them, were a work of no little Difficulty; and a Performance little short of what One of our most famous *Physicians* esteemed the *Greatest Cure* that ever himself had wrought in all his Practice; *To bring an Idiot unto the use of Reason.* But then, to Raise these Miserables up, into an Acquaintance with, and an Experience of, the Christian Religion, and bring them not only to *Know* something of their SAVIOUR, but also to *Live unto* GOD by Him; A *Noble Work* This, But every One must say, No very *Easy* One! [Pp. 28–29.]

After glorifying the work of "our celebrated Eliot," Mather elaborates on the special character of that kind of mission. Like Zinzendorf, Mather holds that a true mission must spread only the essence of the Gospel, not the doctrines of the different Christian denominations.

The Work [of missions] is *Glorious*: But a Principal *Glory* of it, has been the *Purity* of the CHRISTIANITY, which has been brought unto these *Indians*, in our Attempts to *Christianize* them. The RELIGION wherein they have been instructed, has not been the *Religion of a Party*; but the *Pure Religion and Undefiled*, which is evidently contained in the *Sacred Scriptures*. The *Main Things*, which the Instructions given to them have insisted on, have not been, either the Things which *Good Men* may be and have been *Divided* in, or the *Observations* wherein the *Wickedest* Men may act their Part as fairly as the *Holiest*, and with which the *Kingdom of God cometh not.* But the Pure MAXIMS of the *Everlasting Gospel* are those that have been instilled into them; Even those which All *Good Men* are *United* in, and which GOD will keep the *Nations in Distress and Great Perplexity*, until He has compelled His Churches to *Unite* upon. [Pp. 33–34.]

Here again, the Eternal Gospel appears as the basic element of both a missionary theology and an ecumenical theology. Propagation of these "Maxims . . . which All Good Men are United in" "will further the Happy Revolution." Therefore, "let us be doing what we can!" (This Christian version of "revolution," i.e., as the reformation of mankind according to the Maxims of the Eternal Gospel, should not be ignored when studying the history of the concept of revolution.[27]) Mather prophesies the glorious

[27] See Karl Griewank, Der neuzeitliche Revolutionsbegriff: Entstehung und Ent-

aspects of this "Happy Revolution," even anticipating the general liberation of the Negro slaves:

> *Then* should we see, another face on the corners of *England*, the Highlands of *Scotland*, the boggy Recesses of *Ireland*, than there is yet appearing. *Then* should we see the *Africans* no longer treated like meer *Beasts of Burden*, as they are in the Plantations of cruel *Americans*: And the Great Revenues left unto the Charitable Design of *Christianizing* the *Negro's*, would have some Good Account given of them. *Then* should we see the Noble *Essays to Save a Lost World*, carried as far as the Hunger of *Trade*, now makes Men run thro' *Sea* and *Land*, even to the *Indies*. And *Madagascar* itself, where some think they see *Fields ripe for the Harvest*, would not be left unvisited. But above all, *Then* should we see the *Veil* taken off the Minds of the *Jewish Nation*, and GOD would *Shew wonders to the Dead*, and the *Gentiles* would *walk in the Light* of the *New Jerusalem*. [Pp. 47–48.]

To prove how directly the idea of the Eternal Gospel is connected with Puritan missionary activity among the Indians, we need only to compare two items printed in the second section ("Notitia Indiarum") of India Christiana. Having listed the names of the present members (first the English, then the Americans) of the Corporation for Propagating the Gospel in New-England, Mather next presents "Verus Christianismus" ("The Sum of the *Christianity*, Taught unto the Indians") in both the English and Indian languages, under the subtitle, "The RELIGION, *Which* ALL *Good Men are united in* / WAME wunetooog WUSKETOMPAOG pasukqunnineaout ut yeunnag peantamweseongash." This missionary condensation of Christianity is identical with Mather's distillation of the Eternal Gospel into three Maxims, done in a letter to Ziegenbalg and also printed in "Notitia Indiarum." (These two items are arranged for comparison on pp. 188–191 of this paper.)

Finally, Mather connects the new awakening of global Protestantism to its missionary responsibilities with his theological concept of a fresh spreading of the Holy Spirit, prophesied for the

---

wicklung (Weimar, 1955). The modern political understanding of "revolution" goes back to the French Revolution. The English Revolution called itself "The Great Rebellion." The use of "revolution" to describe a reformation of the Christian Church (as Mather does with his "Happy Revolution") is quite unusual, and constitutes a typical Puritan contribution to our understanding of reformation.

final age of the Church. Returning to the radical revolutionary view of a theology of the Holy Spirit, he gives a complete picture of the Church's history as regards the different ways the Holy Spirit has acted in history. First, the Spirit worked mightily among the prophets; after that, for four hundred years before the Incarnation, this prophetic Spirit was silent. Then, with the coming of Christ and with the sending down of the Holy Spirit upon the apostles, a new age of the Church began; for more than two hundred years after this, the Church was enlarged and governed by the gifts of the prophetic Spirit. But then there began a period of decay "when the *Carnal Spirit of this World*, fermented with the Venom of the *Epicurean Philosophy*, entered into the Church" (Letter to Ziegenbalg, p. 71). From that time forth, "the Grieved *Paraclet* withdrew, and there Succeded a Kingdom animated with the Unclean Spirit of Antichrist," so that for twelve hundred and sixty years the rain was withheld "from a Land Languishing under the *Indignation of* GOD." Mather continues:

> But now at last; what if after the *Twelve Hundred & Sixty* Years of *Antichrist* are Expired, there should be heard the *Sound of Abundance of Rain*! What if the *Dove* sent forth *Twice* and Returning again, should go forth a *Third Time*, never to Return any more, and Abide with us, until the *Flood* of Ignorance and Wickedness in which the whole World at this day lies in a manner drowned, shall go off wholly from the face of the Earth? What if the *Kingdom of* GOD should come, with the Joy of the Holy SPIRIT, working with such *Gifts* and in such *Ways*, as He has promised, for both the *Internal & External* Propagation of His Gospel? Whether it shall be so or no; *I know not*, GOD *knows*!
>
> It is very sure, That the Prophecy in *Joel, I will pour out my* SPIRIT *upon all flesh*, yet remains to be accomplished. And it is not unlikely, That the *Effusion of the* SPIRIT, by which the *Primitive Church* flourished, might be but as *Drops* which will be follow'd with *Mighty Showers*, for the Accomplishment of this prophecy still to be Expected in the *Latter Days*. [Pp. 71–72.]

Similarly, "The Joyful Sound" ends (p. 48) with the promise of a new spreading of the Holy Spirit:

> Yea, who can tell, but the Holy SPIRIT promised upon the *Asking*

The English-Indian "Verus Christianismus," from "Notitia Indiarum," pp. 52–55.

(1) There are Glorious Maxims of PIETY, whereto our great SAVIOUR will have the Hearts and Lives of His People conformed, that He may Receive them to the Glory of God ....

There are certain Methods of PIETY directed by our SAVIOUR, that so a Just GOD, offended by our Sins, may be *Reconciled* unto us, and that so we may be *Qualified* for the Enjoyment of GOD in that *Holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord.*

There are certain Points of the *Everlasting Gospel*, according to which, it must *be with a loud Voice* proclaimed unto us, That we must so Fear GOD, *and give Glory unto Him*; and Except the *Kingdom of GOD*, be therewithal first set up in us, we cannot be Received into His *Heavenly Kingdom.*

(2) There are Especially THREE Grand MAXIMS of PIETY, which we must yield our *Assent* and *Consent* unto.

The first is this.

The ONE most High GOD, who is the FATHER, and the SON, and the Holy SPIRIT, must be my GOD, and I must make it the Main Intention of my Life, to please Him with all Holy Obedience and Submission unto Him; and be afraid of Every Thing which His Light in my Soul shall condemn as an Evil Thing.

The second is this.

A Glorious CHRIST, who is the Eternal Son of GOD, Incarnate and Enthroned in our Blessed JESUS, is the Redeemer of Mankind unto whose Great Sacrifice I must repair for Acceptance with GOD; And under His Conduct, I am to Expect a Compleat Happiness for my Immortal Soul, to which He will Restore my Body, when He shall come to Judge the World.

The third is this;

Out of Respect unto GOD and His CHRIST, I must heartily Love my Neighbour, and for ever do unto other Men, as I must own it Reasonable for them to do unto me.

The Letter to Ziegenbalg, from
"Notitia Indiarum," pp. 66–68.

'Tis most certain, That in the *Christian Religion*, which is indeed a Doctrine of PIETY, there are sundry *Practical Articles*, in which all the *Children of GOD* are United; and they who seriously and sincerely Coalesce in this *Union* are to be reckoned among the *Children of GOD*.

It is very certain, That these few Articles of *Practical Piety*, being first offered and well Received, the *Mind* thus *Healed*, will now make a Righter and Fuller Judgment, of those *Lesser Matters*, upon which Good Men have many, mischievous and marvellous Controversies. The *love of GOD will Enlighten the Mind that has it*; And indeed they that manage Controversies, do on both sides make a profession of Zeal to maintain these *Articles of Practical Godliness*.

This therefore is the One Thing, which I earnestly Request of you: That you first of all propound unto the Nations among whom you *abound in the work of the Lord*, these *Articles of the First Magnitude*, wherein *True Christianity* does Firstly and Chiefly consist.

In the *First* Place;

The One GOD, who Subsisteth in *Three Persons*, the *Father*, and the *Son*, and the *Holy Spirit*; and who in the Beginning did *Create* the World; is to be Embraced and Adored for OUR GOD. It must be the *Principal Aim* of our Life, in all things to yield *Obedience* unto Him. And it must be our most hearty Care, to Avoid every Thing which His Light shining in our Soul shall condemn as an Evil Thing.

In the Next Place;

The CHRIST, who is the Eternal SON of GOD Incarnate in our Blessed JESUS, is our only *Redeemer*; who Dying for us, has offered a most Acceptable *Sacrifice* to the Divine Justice, on which relying by Faith we become Reconciled unto GOD; and under the Conduct of Him who being received up into Heaven, now Reigns on the Throne of GOD, we are to expect a wonderful and unspeakable Blessedness for our *Immortal Soul*, whereto our *Body* shall be Re-united in a Glorious *Resurrection*, when He shall *Return* unto us to *Judge the World*.

Lastly;

Being filled with the Love of GOD and of CHRIST, we must most Heartily Love our *Neighbours*; and for ever go by that Golden Rule,

(3) 'Tis a Soul Moulded according to these *Maxims* of PIETY that may, and none but such a Soul truly can, *Rejoyce in the Hope of the Glory of GOD.*

But then, this Vital PIETY, must be accompanied, with an Acknowledgement of those *Truths*, without the *Faith* whereof PIETY cannot be kept Alive, nor can Men *Live unto GOD.* We must therefore Acknowledge the *Sacred Scriptures*, for the *Rule* of what we are to *Believe* and *Practise* in Religion.

Briefly, There is a Degree of PIETY, which must be found in all that are not *Alienated from the Life of GOD.* Except the GOD who is *Above* all, be *Lov'd above all*; Except our SAVIOUR be adored as the GOD *of our Salvation*; Except we lay aside all *Malice* towards our *Neighbour*, and avoid every Course, which our *Conscience* Condemns as a *way of Wickedness*, we cannot *See Life*, but have the *Wrath of GOD abiding on us.* All those *Principles*, which are *Essential* to the Exercise of this PIETY, are *Fundamentals of Religion.* All *Good Men* do come unto them: And all they are *Good Men*, who Live according to them.

Whatsoever you would have Men do unto you, do you even the same unto them.

This is that PURE CHRISTIANITY, which when it shall be by the Trumpets of GOD purely and plainly Preached unto the Nations, the Preachers will doubtless have GOD smiling upon them; *The Hand of the Lord will be with them; and many will Believe, and be turned unto the Lord.*

for it, would make such a Descent, as to *do Wondrously*, and the *Holy Arm of the Lord* would be *made bare in the Eyes of all the Nations*, and *all the Ends of the Earth, should see the Salvation of our* GOD; and the *Dove* would so return to us as to Tarry with us, and the *Flood* of Ignorance and Wickedness, wherein the Earth is now over-whelmed, shall be carried away.

In this lecture I have been able to give only a very general outline; the relations between Puritanism and pietism are much stronger and more complex than time has permitted me to show. I have tried to indicate how strongly agreed these two movements were as regards their understanding of the nature of the Church, of Church history, of the ecumenical task and the missionary responsibility of the Church. Yet, it is most interesting and often amusing to see how, in the midst of discovering common interests and tasks, typically American and typically continental viewpoints appear quite unconsciously. Thus, Cotton Mather gives a typically American interpretation to pietism, emphasizing above all the practical side of Christian activity. Mather reduces the whole system of Christian theology — first, to fourteen points for Western people; then, to three points for non-Western and underdeveloped peoples. Thereby distinguishing clearly between the very few important points and matters "of lesser importance," he places most of the theological problems of the past into the enormous Puritan wastepaper basket. On the other side, continental pietism is much less radical in its conclusions and practical applications, and much more circumspect and cautious, avoiding strong decisions. Pietism is much more deliberate, less courageous, less generous in reducing the dogmatic tradition of the past. It maintains only a very small wastepaper basket into which it discards as few as possible items "of lesser importance," anxiously guarding against any changes in the state-church system as well as any elements of separatism within the church communities themselves. Continental pietism is much more cautious regarding interdenominational coöperation, and modeled more closely on the mystical traditions of contemplation, meditation and theosophical speculation, than is New England Puritanism.

There is one historical question which has bothered me, viz., why did this strong relationship between New England Puritanism

and continental pietism break up so completely in the second half of the eighteenth century? Two reasons occur to me. One reason is that in New England, German Protestantism was represented not by ecumenically-minded pietist groups, but rather by strongly confessional-minded communities, e.g., by Lutherans of the Mühlenberg type. Although Mühlenberg himself had been influenced by the pietism of Halle, he never visited in Boston or tried to meet any New England Puritans; instead, he journeyed from Boston to Pennsylvania without contacting any Puritans of the coastal area. The second reason may be that German Protestantism was completely compromised in the eyes of New England Puritanism by the fact that the Redcoats, against whom Americans fought throughout the Revolutionary War, were Lutherans from Hesse. The red color of the Hessian uniforms evoked so many unecumenical feelings among the Puritans, that they forgot Cotton Mather's theology of the Eternal Gospel or discarded it as inadequate (with respect to the Hessians) to the purpose of the Revolution.

Indeed, the only survival of that unecumenical encounter with the Lutheran Redcoats of Hesse is the term "Hessian fly," the name of a very unpleasant insect imported into this country in the bedstraw of the Hessian soldiery. It seems to me symbolic of the return to that earlier ecumenical concept of Mather, the Eternal Gospel, that today a fly from Marburg, the University of Hesse, has had the privilege of talking to you about the brotherly feelings between American Puritans and German pietists.

MILTON'S ARIANISM AGAIN CONSIDERED

MAURICE KELLEY

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

SINCE 1825, when Bishop Sumner issued the first edition of John Milton's De Doctrina Christiana, the Arianism of that treatise has become an all but unanimously accepted fact. Although reviewers of Sumner's two quarto volumes divided in praising or lamenting Milton's tenets on the Trinity, they united in pronouncing them unorthodox and Arian; [1] and later scholars have generally accepted this nineteenth-century verdict. In 1959, consequently, students of Milton were surprised when William B. Hunter, Jr., under the title "Milton's Arianism Reconsidered," [2] devoted some twenty-five pages to the argument that "we may assert positively that Milton was not an Arian" even though "modern judges are unanimous in branding him one." And more recently, Roland M. Frye,[3] praising Mr. Hunter's work, has gone on to state that "Milton could never be convicted, before a fair and competent theological court, of trinitarian heresy in *Paradise Lost*." With these assertions of the orthodoxy of Milton and his epic I cannot agree; and at the cost of controversy with two close friends, I must argue 1) that Mr. Hunter is wrong in believing that Milton's view of the Son accords with that stated in the Nicene Creed; and 2) that Mr. Frye violates an established principle of textual interpretation when he denies the Arianism of Paradise Lost.

I begin, then, with Mr. Hunter's mistaken belief that Milton should not be branded an Arian, because his tenets on the Trinity actually accord with the Nicene Creed: "As Milton himself observes," writes Mr. Hunter (p. 34), "his view of the Son agrees with the faith expressed in the Apostles' Creed; he might also have added the Nicene Creed." [4] In this conclusion, Mr. Hunter

[1] An extended survey of the 1825–1826 reviews of Milton's treatise appears in Francis E. Mineka's "The Critical Reception of Milton's *De Doctrina Christiana*," Studies in English, The University of Texas, 1943, pp. 115–147.

[2] The Harvard Theological Review, LII, 9–35.

[3] God, Man, and Satan, Princeton, N.J., 1960, pp. 75–76.

[4] Mr. Hunter's belief is not new; it appears earlier in The Eclectic Review,

errs because he has paid insufficient attention to the most important single term in that Creed and to the anathemas that conclude it.[5]

The term is ὁμοούσιος, and it constitutes the first of the two primary tests in the Nicene Creed that Arius and his party could not evade. Was the Son of the same essence (ὁμοούσιος) with the Father? To this question the Creed answered *yes*, and anathematized those who assert that the Son is of a different hypostasis or essence (ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας). But to Milton, as to Arius, the answer would have to be *no*, for Milton persistently holds that the Son is not ὁμοούσιος with the Father. Commenting on certain proof-texts, Milton writes:[6] "All which passages preclude the idea of his [the Son's] coessentiality with the Father" (XIV, 191). And elsewhere in the De Doctrina Milton asserts his anti-Nicene views thus: "Here the expression 'there is none other God but one' excludes not only all other essences, but all other persons whatever. . . . Though the Son be another God, yet in this passage he is called merely 'Lord'; he 'of whom are all things' is clearly distinguished from him 'by whom are all things,' and if a difference of causation prove a difference of essence, he is distinguished also in essence. Besides, since a numercial difference originates in difference of essence, those who are two numerically, must be also two essentially" (XIV, 203); "Now it is manifest that those who have not the same will, cannot have the same essence. It appears however from many passages, that the Father and Son have not, in a numerical sense, the same intelligence or will. . . . Those therefore whose understanding and will are not numerically the same, cannot have the same essence" (XIV, 231); "It must be under-

---

N. S. XXV, 1826, 16: "But, though symbolizing thus far with Arius, he differs most essentially from him in maintaining that the Son is consubstantial with the Father — '*Filii autem ex substantia ejus producti proprius erat Pater.*' Hence it will be seen, that he held literally and entirely the Nicene Creed." Here, the reviewer fails to distinguish, as Milton does, between essence and substance, and he consequently misinterprets the Latin passage quoted from Milton.

[5] My text of the Nicene Creed comes from J. N. D. Kelly, Early Christian Creeds, London, 1950. My discussion of this creed is likewise indebted to Kelly and also to Edward Burton, Testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, Oxford, 1829.

[6] Like Mr. Hunter, I cite and quote Sumner's translation from the Columbia edition of Milton's Works, New York, 1931–1938.

stood from this [Hebrews 1:2–3], that God imparted to the Son as much as he pleased of the divine nature, nay of the divine substance itself, care being taken not to confound the substance with the whole essence, which would imply, that the Father had given to the Son what he retained numerically the same himself; which would be a contradiction of terms instead of a mode of generation. This is the whole that is revealed concerning the generation of the Son of God. Whoever wishes to be wiser than this, becomes foiled in his pursuit after wisdom, entangled in the deceitfulness of vain philosophy, or rather of sophistry, and involved in darkness" (XIV, 193). Such statements preclude Milton's subscription to the Nicene Creed and place him among those anathematized in the concluding part of that confession of faith.

These same anathemas — to which Mr. Hunter gives too little attention [7] — also contain the second test that the Arians could not evade. Was there ever a time when the Son did not exist? To this question, the Creed answered *no* by anathematizing "those who say, There was when He was not, and, Before being born He was not." These two clauses ban the Arian denial of the Son's eternity and the consequent belief that the Father's generation of the Son was a temporal act. But this Arian belief Milton firmly professes: "the Son was begotten of the Father in consequence of his decree, and therefore within the limits of time, for the decree itself must have been anterior to the execution of the decree" (XIV, 189). Thus in this second test — as in the first posed by the term ὁμοούσιος — Milton disagrees with the Nicene Creed.[8]

[7] See, for instance, p. 25, where Mr. Hunter asserts: "This and only this point [that the Logos had been created *ex nihilo*] was condemned as heresy at Nicaea." The Nicene Creed also anathematized four other Arian errors: that the Son was begotten in time, that he is of a different essence, that he is created, and that he is subject to alteration and change.

[8] Equally unsatisfactory is Mr. Hunter's further argument (pp. 20, 33–34) for Milton's orthodoxy: that Milton's view of the Son is a return to Philo's concept of a Logos existing in two stages: "a first one, uncreated and from eternity, when it exists only as God's thought (not as a person), and a second one when it is generated as God externalizes his thought into an intelligible world." By Milton's reasoning, however, this concept could not lead to the orthodox view of the Son; "If he is the Son, either he must have been originally in the Father, and have proceeded from him, or he must always have been as he is now, separate from the Father, self-existent and independent. If he was originally in the Father, but

Since Milton's views on the Son are therefore not orthodox, I pass next to the question of whether or not they may properly be called Arian. In this matter, our chief lexicographical authority, the Oxford English Dictionary, is inadequate, for it restricts the term to immediate followers of Arius and to fourth and fifth century doctrinal dissensions, whereas anyone who has read in English theological literature of the seventeenth century and later recognizes that Arian has a broader and more modern denotation.

In 1673, for instance, Milton himself [9] tells us that "The Arian and Socinian are charg'd to dispute against the Trinity: they affirm to believe the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, according to Scripture, and the Apostolic Creed; as for terms of Trinity, Triniunity, Coessentiality, Tripersonality, and the like, they reject them as Scholastic Notions, not to be found in Scripture, which by a general Protestant Maxim is plain and perspicuous abundantly to explain its own meaning in the properest words, belonging to so high a Matter and so necessary to be known; a mystery indeed in their Sophistic Subtilties, but in Scripture a plain Doctrin." In 1724, Daniel Waterland [10] refers to Arians in his own day: "Since the Publication of my *Second Defense* in the Cause of our Blessed Lord's *Divinity*, I have been waiting to see what further Attempts we were to have from the *Arians*. I perceive They are still resolute in their Opposition to the Faith of *Christ*." In 1829, Edward Burton [11] speaks of those who "were generally Unitarians, what is now called either Arian or Socinian." And later, The New Schaff-Herzog (s.v. Arianism) tells that "After Theodosius, Arianism . . . reappeared from time to time as an isolated theological opinion, especially in England. Emlyn, Whiston, Whitby, Samuel Clarke, Lardner, and many who are ranked among Socinians and Unitarians, held Arian sentiments; but Milton and Isaac Newton, though approaching the Arian view on the relation of the Son to the Father, differed widely from Arianism in spirit and aim"; and M'Clintock and Strong (Cyclo-

now exists separately, he has undergone a certain change at some time or other, and is therefore mutable" (XIV, 309). And those "who assert that the Son of God . . . is subject to alteration or change," runs the Nicene Creed, "the Catholic Church anathematizes."

[9] Of True Religion, Works, VI, 169.

[10] A Farther Vindication of Christ's Divinity, London, sig. B.

[11] Testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, p. 473, quoting Lindsey's Apology.

paedia, s.v. Arianism) writes of "Modern Arianism" and speaks of Lardner as "the most learned of all English Arians." With the application of the term thus extended to more modern times, we may now look at other quotations which define this more recent Arianism by restricting it to a kind of anti-Trinitarianism that approaches more closely the orthodox views of the Trinity than do Socinianism and Unitarianism, which insist that Christ was merely a man. In 1826, John Pye Smith [12] tells us that "Milton's Arianism . . . was high above the lower parts of the slippery steep"; in the same year, The British Critic [13] informs its readers that Milton's "doctrine, though lower than that of Clarke, is probably higher than the highest Arianism known to antiquity"; in the year before, The Quarterly Review [14] comments: "On the divinity of the Son of God, his [Milton's] opinions approximate to the highest Arianism, and though we may regret that, upon this vital and practical point, such a man is not altogether with us, they will afford no cause of triumph to the modern Socinian"; and in 1912, Weldon [15] asserts that "Milton was always rather an Arian than a Unitarian." These quotations constitute valid lexicographic evidence; they represent educated English usage; and any further lexicographer, exploring the meaning of Arian beyond the perfunctory work of the Oxford English Dictionary, must perforce take them into account. They establish that the term Arian may be applied generally to theologians of the past four centuries who do not accept orthodox dogmas concerning the Trinity, and that within this usage the term denotes more specifically those who stress the divinity, as opposed to the mere humanity, of Jesus Christ, with the term high Arian denoting particularly those who approach most closely orthodox dogma and are farthest from Socinian and Unitarian views. And these quotations, finally, taken in conjunction with Milton's 1673 definition of the contemporary Arian, firmly establish that Mr. Hunter errs when he objects to Masson's and my calling Milton an Arian. Sound and continued usage sanctions our doing so; and Milton's 1673 account of Arian tenets repeats point for point his own views

[12] The Evangelical Magazine, N. S., IV, 51.
[13] II, 287.
[14] XXXII, 452–453.
[15] The Nineteenth Century, LXXI, 908.

on the Son earlier stated in the De Doctrina. We cannot, therefore, deny to Milton the name of Arian, though I still believe that anti-Trinitarian is a more precise term, for it takes account both of Milton's dislike of non-scriptural, scholastic terms and of his claim that he arrived at his particular views through an independent study of scripture rather than by dependence on others.

With the Arianism — or perhaps better, the anti-Trinitarianism — of Milton's De Doctrina thus established, I pass now to Mr. Frye's belief that "Milton could never be convicted, before a fair and competent theological court, of trinitarian heresy in *Paradise Lost*." Here, refutation becomes more difficult, for in his epic most of Milton's statements concerning the Son either quote or echo scripture, and anyone arguing for the Arianism of the poem faces the difficulty that confronted the orthodox bishops at Nicaea and forced them to resort to non-scriptural terms. At Nicaea, so Gwatkin [16] tells us, the dispute was not on the authority of scripture, but of the interpretation of it, with the Arians evading every scriptural expression proposed: "If it were Of God, the answer was 'All things are of God.' If the Lord were described as the Image of God, 'So are we, for In the Image of God made he Man.' If as the Son, 'We too are sons of God.' . . . If as True God of True God, even this was evaded, for the Arians recognized him as true God *in their sense* from his creation." A similar situation obtains in interpreting Paradise Lost. The epic, for instance, echoing Philippians 2:5, describes the Son as "Thron'd in highest bliss / Equal to God, and equally enjoying / God-like fruition" (III, 305–307). These lines, the exponent of Milton's orthodoxy maintains, voice a Trinitarian view. They do no such thing, retorts the advocate of Milton's Arianism, for on the word equal Milton comments thus in the De Doctrina: "Christ therefore, having received all these things from the Father, and 'being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God,' Philipp. ii. 5. namely, because he had obtained them by gift, not by robbery. For if this passage imply his co-equality with the Father, it rather refutes than proves his unity of essence; since equality cannot exist but between two

[16] Studies of Arianism, Cambridge, 1900, p. 49.

or more essences" (XIV, 343).[17] And so just as the Council of Nicaea was forced from scripture to the non-scriptural ὁμοούσιος, so can we resolve the ambiguity of Paradise Lost only by leaving the epic and having recourse to an established principle of textual interpretation and to context. The principle is that of interpreting ambiguous expressions by use of other less equivocal statements of the same author; and by context I mean the historical situation that indicates the fitness of employing this principle — in this particular case, of using the clear prose of the De Doctrina to solve the puzzles of Paradise Lost.

Elsewhere, in a work just cited in footnote 17, I have earlier reconstructed in some detail the context of Paradise Lost. Put briefly, it is as follows. According to contemporary biographers, Milton began composition of Paradise Lost about 1655; he published the poem in 1667. According to these same biographers and other evidence, composition of the De Doctrina in its present form began also about 1655; and it attained the stage of a fair copy ca. 1658–ca. 1660, with Milton continuing to revise the manuscript after that date. These manuscript revisions and Milton's 1673 statement of the Arian credo indicate that during his last fourteen years Milton did not materially alter his views on the Son expressed in the De Doctrina. In context, then, the epic and the treatise are synchronous works and can be assumed to be two expressions in different forms of one and the same body of religious belief. A comparison of the two works amply verifies this assumption. The same doctrines,[18] the same clusters of proof-texts,[19] and even the same images and diction [20] appear

[17] This is not a hypothetical case. For controversy on the proper interpretation of this verse passage, see Arthur Sewell, A Study in Milton's Christian Doctrine, London, 1939, pp. 86–88, and Maurice Kelley, This Great Argument, Princeton, N. J., 1941, pp. 30–31.

[18] See, for instance, the close similarity existing between the treatise and the epic in their discussions of free will and predestination (This Great Argument, pp. 16–19).

[19] Compare, for instance, the following accounts in the treatise and the epic: "Seven of these [angels], in particular, are described as traversing the earth in the execution of their ministry. Zech. iv. 10. 'those seven are the eyes of Jehovah which run to and fro through the whole earth.' Rev. v. 6. 'which are the seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the earth.' See also i. 4. ['and from the seven Spirits which are before his throne.'] and iv. 5. ['and there were seven lamps of fire burning before the throne, which are the seven Spirits of God' "] (XV, 103).

in both works. And in one instance, finally, one of Milton's anti-Trinitarian conclusions in the De Doctrina is unambiguously repeated in Paradise Lost. This tenet concerns the manner in which the Son was begotten. Was the Son begotten by nature or by Will? [21] This question arose in the early struggles with Arianism and elicited the orthodox answer that the generation of the Son resulted from the nature of God. Unlike the dogma of eternal generation, this answer never attained the authority of symbolic statement; but from patristic times on, it became a recognized corollary of Trinitarianism. St. Thomas Aquinas,[22] for instance, writes: "It is therefore clear how false was the assertion of the Arians that the Father begot the Son by His will; because that which is done voluntarily is not natural." Hooker [23] takes note of "Those Natural, necessary, and Internal Operations of God, the *Generation* of the Son, the *Proceeding* of the Spirit"; and a modern theologian [24] puts the matter thus: "*The generation of the Son is a necessary act of God.* Some of the early Church fathers taught that it was an act determined by a divine volition and therefore free; but this would make the existence of the Son contingent and thus rob Him of his divinity. Then the Son would not be equal to and *homoousios* with the Father, for the Father exists necessarily, and cannot be conceived as non-existent. The generation of the Son must be regarded as a necessary and perfectly natural act of God." In the De Doctrina, however, Milton reasoned otherwise. The Son results from a decree, and the de-

"Th' Arch-Angel Uriel, one of the seav'n
Who in God's presence, neerest to his Throne
Stand ready at command, and are his Eyes
That run through all the Heav'ns, or down to th' Earth
Bear his swift errands over moist and dry,
O're Sea and Land; him Satan thus accostes.
Uriel, for thou of those seav'n Spirits that stand
In sight of Gods high Throne, gloriously bright (III, 648–655)."

[20] For instance: "it [renovation] is sometimes spoken of under the metaphor . . . of tasting" (XV, 355) with "This my long sufferance and my day of grace / They who neglect and scorn, shall never taste" (III, 198–199). And "in profluentem aquam immerguntur" (XVI, 168) compared with "Baptizing in the profluent streame" (XII, 442).

[21] Harry A. Wolfson, The Philosophy of the Church Fathers, Cambridge, Mass., 1956, I, 217–232.

[22] Summa contra Gentiles, IV, xi.

[23] Of the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Polity, I, 2.

[24] L. Berkhof, Reformed Dogmatics, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1932, I, 74.

crees of God are "impelled by no necessity, but according to his own will" (XIV, 65). Consequently, Milton writes, "however the generation of the Son may have taken place, it arose from no natural necessity, as is generally contended, but was no less owing to the decree and will of the Father than his priesthood or kingly power, or his resuscitation from the dead. . . . For questionless, it was in God's power consistently with the perfection of his own essence not to have begotten the Son, inasmuch as generation does not pertain to the nature of the Deity, who stands in no need of propagation" (XIV, 185–187). In Paradise Lost, this last clause finds an echo in Adam's reply to God: "No need that thou / Shouldst propagat" (VIII, 419–420).[25] Thus, to summarize the argument of this long paragraph, the synchronous composition of Paradise Lost and the De Doctrina, the appearance in both works of the same doctrines, clusters of proof-texts, images, and diction, and the clear verse echo of an anti-Trinitarian position present in Milton's treatise — these facts indicate a context for Paradise Lost that fully justifies employment of the principle of interpreting expressions in the epic that derive from scripture and are open to conflicting interpretations by means of statements in the De Doctrina that are not equivocal and are consequently not subject to controversy.

If we follow this principle, Paradise Lost cannot be taken as orthodox in its dogma on the Trinity. Behind the poetic echo of Philippians 2:5, the verse statement that the Son is "equal to God" and "equally" enjoys "God-like fruition," lies Milton's belief, stated unambiguously in prose, that the word equal, when it is applied to the Son, signifies duality, rather than unity, of essence with the Father. When the epic, echoing Hebrews 1:3, states that in the Son "all his Father shon / Substantially express'd" (III, 139–140), we should not "confound the substance

[25] Further indication of the presence of this anti-Trinitarian belief in Paradise Lost appears in a related parallel between Paradise Lost and the De Doctrina. In the treatise Milton writes: "nor did the Father beget him from any natural necessity, but of his own free will, a mode more . . . agreeable to the paternal dignity" (XIV, 187). This distinction Adam repeats in commenting on the relation in which his future sons will stand to him: "what if thy Son / Prove disobedient, and reprov'd, retort, / Wherefore didst thou beget me? I sought it not: / Wouldst thou admit for his contempt of thee / That proud excuse? Yet him not thy election, / But Natural necessity begot" (X, 760–765).

with the whole essence," and maintain that Milton is here expressing the orthodox view of the Son's coessentiality with the Father. If the historical method has any validity, Paradise Lost must be recognized as a poem written by an Arian and containing Arian views; and contrary to Mr. Frye's opinion, any theological court denying this fact must indeed be considered incompetent.

I am not privy to the motives behind Messrs. Hunter's and Frye's attempts — or those of earlier scholars [26] — to return Milton to Trinitarian orthodoxy, but I suspect that two of them are a high admiration for Milton counterbalanced by a feeling that something basically irreligious inheres in Arianism. Mr. Hunter's "branding" and Mr. Frye's "convicted" and "court" suggest such a suspicion. If such is the case, then these admirers of Milton err by showing him less respect than they would wish and by failing to recognize in Arianism its essential religiosity. They show Milton less respect than they would wish by implicitly denying that basic courtesy of protestantism that Milton so reasonably requests: "Since I enrol myself among the number of those who acknowledge the word of God alone as the rule of faith, and freely advance what appears to me more clearly deducible from the Holy Scriptures than the commonly received opinion, I see no reason why anyone who belongs to the same Protestant or Reformed Church, and professes to acknowledge the same rule of faith . . . should take offence at my freedom . . . as I impose my authority on no one, but merely propose what I think more worthy of belief than the creed in general acceptation. I only entreat that my readers will ponder and examine my statements in a spirit which desires to discover nothing but the truth, and with a mind free from prejudice. For without intending to oppose the authority of Scripture . . . I only take upon myself to refute human interpretations . . . conformably to my right, or rather to my duty as a man" (XIV, 177–179). By protestant standards, we must grant Milton this right to search for the truth as he sees it; and if his quest ends in an answer that we cannot accept, we must at least accord Milton the respect due to any

[26] See, for instance, A. D. Barber, Bibliotheca Sacra, XVII, 1860, 28–34; Martin Larsen, PMLA, XLI, 1926, 891–934; A. S. P. Woodhouse, University of Toronto Quarterly, V, 1935–1936, 138–139; and Sewell, A Study, pp. 85–108.

man who has conscientiously and laboriously endeavored to reunite the scattered members of that hewed virgin of which Milton writes in Areopagitica. We should not work to misrepresent or apologize. And such is particularly the case when the answer at which Milton arrives is not an irreligious one. "The Arian Creed," as Sumner's most acute reviewer pointed out,[27] "is not made up of the mere negations of belief . . . but includes a series of propositions far more staggering to reason than even the arithmetical contradiction disingenuously imputed to the Trinitarian doctrine." If the Arian errs, he errs in his zeal to assert the simplicity and supremacy of a single self-existent deity and to preserve inviolate the metaphysical unity of the Godhead. We should consequently cease feeling embarrassed because our greatest English religious poet held and expressed views on the Trinity that are considered errors and heresy. We should accept those views for what they are — products of a pious search, the precious life blood of a master spirit. By so doing, we realize a prime ideal of the man and poet that so many of us admire — the ideal of tolerance for which Milton so powerfully pleaded during the greater part of his active life.

[27] The Eclectic Review, N. S. XXV, 1826, 114.

DRYDEN'S APPARENT SCEPTICISM IN RELIGIO LAICI

ELIAS J. CHIASSON

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

PROFESSOR BREDVOLD'S view of Dryden as a philosophic sceptic in the general tradition of Pyrrho, Sextus Empiricus, and Montaigne, or as a "fideist" after the fashion of certain Roman Catholic apologists,[1] continues to be the generally accepted one. Samuel Monk, in summing up the direction that Dryden studies have taken, says: "Dryden's naturally sceptical temper found support in the various scepticisms of Montaigne, of the Royal Society, and of Catholic apologetics." [2] It is this scepticism, so the story goes, which drove Dryden to the shelter of the Roman Catholic Church.

Mindful of Dryden's later conversion, Bredvold is certain that Dryden's position, even when he wrote Religio Laici, had no real affinities with Anglicanism. He says: "If the question of his sincerity is to be raised, it would therefore seem more discerning to raise it in connection with his Anglicanism in the . . . [Religio Laici], rather than with his conversion a few years later." That this is his point is clear, for he says that in 1682 Dryden was "far along on the road to the Roman communion. . . ." [3]

The purpose of this article is to show that there is no need to posit anything so special as pyrrhonistic scepticism or Catholic *fideism* to explain Dryden's position,[4] and that Dryden belongs to that tradition of Christian humanism which had, in varying degrees and with varying speculative or practical emphases, been common to patristic, medieval, and Renaissance Christendom. In its broadest extension, such a humanism denotes a world view which distinguishes between the order of grace and the order of nature, which subordinates the second to the first, and which

[1] L. I. Bredvold, The Intellectual Milieu of John Dryden (Ann Arbor, 1934).

[2] Samuel Holt Monk, "Dryden Studies: A Survey," ELH, XIV (1947).

[3] Bredvold, Intellectual Milieu, 121.

[4] A. W. Secord, JEGP, XXIV (1935), 463, reviewing Bredvold's book is convinced of Dryden's fideism, but is less careful than Bredvold in defining it as "the medieval distinction between reason and faith." Such a definition would make Catholicism generally and a whole array of Anglicans fideistic.

recognizes not the destruction but the perfection of nature by grace. Such a view does not permit exalting the supernatural at the expense of the natural, on the one hand, or exalting the natural at the expense of the supernatural on the other, or even, while accepting both orders, insisting on their divergence. Tertullian during the patristic period, the Averroists and William of Occam during the medieval period, Luther and Calvin at the Reformation, various sceptics of the sixteenth century, and the "Baconians" and Deists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries illustrate that at no time was such a unified view of life universally embraced.[5]

But from the time of Hooker to the Restoration and beyond, Anglicans continued to assert the central imperatives of this Christian humanism. After the Restoration, certain changes occur which presage but do not yet officially announce the disappearance of that "massive but flexible tradition. . . ." [6]

The Cambridge Platonists, for example, continued to insist on the closest and most intimate relation between religion and philosophy. Truth, whatever its source, from reason or revelation, has its origin in God. Recognizing the limitations of man's cognitive faculties as a result of the Fall,[7] they affirmed the necessity of supplementing "the truth of natural inscription" with the "truth of divine revelation. . . ." [8] Viewing reason as the distinctive quality of man, they affirmed, much like Hooker and the medieval tradition, that reason is the very voice of God.[9] Encouraged by the conviction, central to any Christian humanism, that "all Truth is Catholic," they turned to the pagan philosophers for much of their inspiration. The contemporary need, as Cudworth saw, in view of the antagonisms which surrounded him,[10] was a "philosophy of religion confirmed and established by philosophical

[5] Among the pertinent studies of this question are: D. Bush, The Renaissance and English Humanism (Toronto, 1939); G. G. Walsh, Medieval Humanism (New York, 1942); H. Haydn, The Counter-Renaissance (New York, 1950); H. Baker, The Wars of Truth: Studies in the Decay of Christian Humanism in the Earlier Seventeenth Century (Cambridge, Mass., 1952).

[6] Baker, Wars of Truth, 98.

[7] John Smith, Selected Discourses (Cambridge, 1859), 61.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Benjamin Whichcote, Moral and Religious Aphorisms (London, 1753), 76.

[10] The contemporary need was to counter the twin dangers of Puritan bibliolatry and Hobbistic materialism.

reasons. . . ." [11] Here faith anticipates and completes the findings of reason, and philosophy is the handmaid of religion.[12] Since Truth, whatever its source, is ultimately grasped by reason, there can be no conflict between faith and reason, or between revealed and natural truth. As Whichcote observes, "Our reason is not confounded by our religion, but awakened, excited, employed, directed, and improved. . . ." [13] With a Dryden-like metaphor, Culverwel points to the relationship which properly exists between reason and revelation: "The light of Reason doth no more prejudice the light of faith, then the light of a Candle doth extinguish the light of a Star." [14] Whichcote suggests a similar relationship by his choice of verbs: "Reason discovers what is natural, and reason receives what is supernatural." [15]

The Latitudinarians preserved a similar distinction between nature and grace. For while it is true that most Latitudinarians tended to "frame a reasonable system of belief and then demonstrate that it was actually the same as the traditional faith," [16] they constantly emphasized that natural religion must be supplemented by the disclosures of revelation. Stillingfleet is typical in defending revelation by an appeal to reason and arguing that there are cogent "grounds for divine revelation from natural light," but at the same time insisting that "the immediate dictates of natural light are not to be the measure of divine revelation. . . ." [17] The sermon tradition from Isaac Barrow through Robert South to Tillotson illustrates the habit of mind we have been describing. Barrow, in a sermon delivered in 1661, exhorts us to obtain Wisdom "by the faithfull exercise of our Reason, carefull observation of things, diligent study of the Divine Law,

[11] Ralph Cudworth, The True Intellectual System of the Universe (London, 1845), Preface.

[12] Smith, Selected Discourses, 442.

[13] Whichcote, Select Sermons (London, 1698), 298.

[14] Quoted in M. L. Wiley, The Subtle Knot (Cambridge, Mass., 1952), 93.

[15] Whichcote, Aphorisms, 99.

[16] G. R. Cragg, From Puritanism to the Age of Reason (Cambridge, Eng., 1950), 68. However, S. L. Bethell, The Cultural Revolution of the Seventeenth Century (London, 1951), 15, takes issue with G. N. Clark's assertion that post-Restoration writers "tried to justify Christianity itself not on the ground that it was divinely revealed but on the ground that it was reasonable." On the contrary, says Bethell, "Seventeenth-century thought, both earlier and later, has a subtlety and precision that eludes such broad-meshed categories."

[17] Edward Stillingfleet, Origines Sacrae (London, 1666), Bk. II, Ch. V, passim.

watchfull reflexion upon our selves, vertuous and religious practice; *but especially, by imploring the Divine influence, the original spring of light, and the fountain of all true knowledge. . . .*" [18] A similar spirit may be found in South's sermon preached in 1691. "Let a Man," he says, with imagery which suggests the manner of Dryden, "carefully attend to the *Voice* of his *Reason*, and all the Dictates of Natural Morality. . . . For though Reason . . . is, indeed, but a weak, and diminutive *Light*, compared to Revelation . . . it ought to be no disparagement to a Star, that it is not a *Sun*." [19] Tillotson is equally convinced that there is "a natural and immutable and eternal reason for that which we call goodness and virtue," to which man may arrive "under the influence of God's grace and assistance which is never wanting to our sincere indeavours. . . ." [20]

The conclusion therefore would seem to be that the Anglican tradition (to which Dryden properly belongs) preserved, with varying emphases, the traditional balance between reason and faith. If because of the absence of a principle of infallibility, which could settle certain controversial questions by means of dogmatic pronouncements, Anglicanism was to make its appeal finally to reason, the nature of this reason must not be disregarded.[21]

At this point it is essential, if we hope to understand Dryden, to make distinctions not always made in present Dryden criticism. For example, it must not be too readily assumed that controversialists, both Anglican and Catholic, are the most reliable judges of the precise drift of each others' opinions. One must furthermore also avoid labelling as "fideistic" positions which seem quite consistent with positions which, when held by another, one calls rationalistic.[22] To exaggerate the rationalism of the seventeenth-

[18] This sermon and one by South and Tillotson respectively are conveniently reproduced in Seventeenth-Century Verse and Prose, eds, White, Wallerstein, Quintana (New York, 1952). For the present quotation see ibid., II, 186.

[19] Ibid., II, 185.

[20] Ibid., II, 204.

[21] Throughout the Anglican tradition there was general agreement that, in the words of Donne (Works, ed. H. Alford, II, 7), "no natural man can do anything towards a supernatural work. . . ."

[22] Bredvold is especially confusing on this point. At page 81, Bredvold says that Hooker and Chillingworth "appealed unhesitatingly to reason." And yet Hooker (Polity, III, viii, 18) insists that men's reason in divine matters must

century Anglican, for example, would be as unsatisfactory as to exaggerate the fideism of seventeenth-century Catholicism.[23] To say that Anglicans unhesitatingly made their appeal to reason demands, as we have seen, a clear understanding of the nature of that reason. Similarly, the mere exploitation by a Catholic of the importance of the principle of infallibility is not *necessarily* fideistic. Nor is it a mere seventeenth-century apologetic device, but perhaps the central difficulty which complicates the reunion of Catholicism with what it views as the separated brethren.

The difficulty of Anglicans with Catholic infallibility was not, generally speaking, a reflection of greater Anglican confidence in the power of human reason, but a resistance to the *exclusive* character of Catholic claims. Certainly in the seventeenth century, Anglicanism, Sectarianism, and Catholicism were agreed on the necessity for some principle which would protect the faith against the obvious fallibility of human reason. Hooker is typical of the Anglican anchoring of the truth in reason — not reason *sans phrase*, but reason protected by tradition and Scripture and illuminated by the Grace of God.[24] The Sectarians, less dependent on tradition and relying primarily on revelation, found their stay in the *inner light*. Catholics, convinced that both Protestant positions were either gross or more subtle varieties of reliance on the individual reason, insisted on the competence of the Church to examine the findings of reason, revelation, and tradition, and to enforce dogmatically the results of this examination. Methodologically these three concepts of infallibility do not differ greatly.

---

not be thought of as working independently of "the aid and assistance of God's most blessed Spirit." Furthermore, it is difficult to see why Chillingworth's professed willingness to adopt Roman Catholicism if infallibility were indeed a fact (Anglicanism, eds. P. E. More and F. L. Cross, 113), as well as Sherlock's (cited in Bredvold, 94), is consistent with the sturdy rationalism of Chillingworth and Sherlock, and yet that a similar suggestion in Dryden is conclusive evidence of his hankering for authority.

[23] Bredvold's treatment of Edward Worsley (Intellectual Milieu, 94) illustrates the unsatisfactoriness of such exaggerations. Worsley, a Catholic apologete, defends himself against the allegation of impugning reason by conceding that "Reason euer precedes Faith, and is grounded vpon those rational motiues which Induce to Belieue" but that "Faith, precisely considered as Faith, relies vpon a quite Different Obiect, God's pure Reuelation. . . ." Bredvold regards this as a "tangle of logic" and as a typical example of fideistic apologetic, in spite of the fact that, as this paper shows, this position is common to Hooker and Laud and the majority of Anglicans.

[24] Hooker, Polity, III, viii, 18.

Much of the difficulty was caused not by the concept itself, but by the precise location of this infallible power. To a thoroughgoing rationalist, any one of the three would be an illegitimate restriction of the power of reason.

Before proceeding to an examination of Religio Laici, one might cite a passage from Dryden's life of Plutarch in which Dryden sets forth what he conceives to be the highest achievement and yet the serious limitations of the unregenerate, pagan mind (ancient or modern). "I have ever thought," he says, "that the wise men in all ages have not much differed in their opinions of religion; *I mean as it is grounded on human reason*: for reason, *as far as it is right*, must be the same in all men; and *truth being but one*, they must consequently think in the same train." The wise pagans "doubtless believed the identity of one Supreme Intellectual Being, which we call God." Of Plutarch he says that Plutarch "could not know" the way to salvation "without revelation, and the revelation was not known to him." Plutarch therefore suffered the general pagan disability of being able to believe "no more than" could be deduced "from the principles of nature. . . ." [25] The references to the oneness of Truth, and the hierarchical balance of reason and revelation required for its attainment suggest Hooker and the Cambridge Platonists and the general tradition which we have described, not the variety of scepticism generally alleged.

Dryden does not substantially change his position in Religio Laici. For while in the extended image which opens the poem Dryden does deprecate the complete sufficiency of reason, his apparently melancholy conclusion that "reason's glimmering ray" can but "guide us upward to a better day" is but the orthodox Christian-humanistic position, already described, that reason without faith cannot come to the fullness of Christian truth. There is, as yet, no real reason to suppose that Dryden is rejecting reason as operative on its own object. Since reason does have the power to "guide us upward to a better day," it can scarcely be said to be inoperative, unless one wishes to say that it is in-

[25] John Dryden, Works, ed. Scott-Saintsbury, XVII, 33. This passage is quoted in Bredvold, Intellectual Milieu, 114, as evidence of Dryden's "rationalism" in spite of Dryden's clear distinction between revelation and reason.

operative in Hooker, the Cambridge Platonists, and such men as Barrow and South.

As he does in his life of Plutarch, Dryden in the Religio Laici makes the traditional concession that reason can arrive at God's existence ("one first principle must be") while insisting on the impossibility of reason arriving at His Nature ("But what or who, that UNIVERSAL He . . . Not even the Stagirite himself could see."). Dryden would undoubtedly have agreed with Laud: "The *quod sit*, that there is a God, blear-eyed reason can see; but the *quid sit*, what it is, is infinitely beyond all the fathoms of reason. . . ." [26] Laud is typically Anglican on this point: "Though reason without grace cannot see the way to heaven nor believe this Book in which God hath written the way, yet grace is never placed but in a reasonable creature. . . ." [27] Like Laud, Dryden makes a distinction between reason and faith. Reason can establish the preambles of faith; it requires a grace to believe the Truth presented.

Dryden's reference to Hooker in the Preface to Religio Laici [28] would suggest that he conceived himself to be in a tradition which by no means repudiated the place of reason in the discovery of religious truth. His reference to the "light of nature as the next in dignity" is scarcely a repudiation of the power of reason. What he is specifically opposed to is the Deists' professed ability "to be able to find out that there is one supreme agent or intellectual agent which we call God; that praise and prayer are his due worship; and the rest of those deducements. . . ." Such religious sophistication (and here Dryden includes the pagans) Dryden, after the manner of some of the Fathers, attributes to "the faint remnants or dying flames of revealed religion in the posterity of Noah. . . ." Here Dryden is certainly more restrictive than Hooker who would have allowed a greater competence to the human mind. Nevertheless the Pauline reference prevents us from concluding that Dryden sees the

[26] Anglicanism, eds. P. E. More and F. L. Cross (Milwaukee, 1935), 100.

[27] Ibid., 102.

[28] I find it impossible to conclude, with Bredvold (Intellectual Milieu, 119), that the Preface to Religio Laici makes it clear that Dryden had "Hooker and other Anglican 'philosophizing divines' in mind. . . ." As a matter of fact, Dryden there associates himself with "venerable Hooker" in resisting the extreme individualism of the sectarians.

unregenerate pagan mind as completely powerless with respect to religious and moral duties. If Dryden's belief in the oneness of Truth, referred to earlier, can be appealed to, his restrictiveness here will seem less severe. It is furthermore to be remembered that Dryden's restrictions on what is attainable "by our discourse" is immediately followed by the caveat: "I mean as simply considered, and without the benefit of divine illumination." Like Hooker,[29] Dryden defines faith as "the seal of heaven impressed upon our human understanding."

The brunt of Dryden's attack is directed not against reason but against the rationalism of the Deists, that is to say, against the absence in their system of a concept of grace — flowing from the fact of the Incarnation. Against the deistic confidence in the rationally conceived common notions, Dryden asserts the primacy of the faith. His claim that "Reason saw not, till Faith sprung the light" and that therefore " 'Tis Revelation what thou think'st Discourse" does not fracture the synthesis of reason and faith, for in Dryden reason does see, though admittedly only after the act of faith. He merely asks that the Deists recognize the unconscious debt that they owe to a long tradition of religious experience. In pursuit of his argument, Dryden asks why, if the common notions of prayer "to one sole God" and an afterlife of happiness or reprobation are available to the unregenerate reason, why the pagans, Plato, Aristotle, Plutarch, Seneca, or Cicero ("those giant wits") were so contradictory and confused about such matters.

That Dryden's intention is not to reject the order of nature is clear from his admission that man is capable of a natural movement towards remorse, a movement which, however, is inadequate because of the disproportion between God offended and man offending: "See then, the Deist lost: remorse for vice/ Not paid, or paid, inadequate in price." In other words, Dryden is insisting on the traditionally accepted meaning of the Incarnation

[29] Even Hooker, who cannot be suspect of disregarding or understressing the rights of reason, insists (Polity, III, viii, 15) that "other motives and inducements, be they never so strong and consonant unto reason, are notwithstanding uneffectual of themselves to work faith concerning this principle [i.e. the reliability of Scripture], if the special grace of the Holy Ghost concur not to the enlightening of our minds."

as a dramatic instance of the mercy of God with which man can coöperate but which he must not attempt to supplant with his own private ethic, no matter how noble. This is the traditional view, tirelessly reiterated,[30] that "no natural man can do anything towards a supernatural work." [31]

Dryden then proceeds to assert the necessity of Scripture if man is to know this particular economy of grace. He does so in the context of the formidable argument of the Deists, based on the fact that since Revelation was of a certain time and place, pagans — past and present — remain out of this so-called economy of grace which the orthodox insist upon. Dryden feels the cogency of this argument, but rejects the implications the Deists would draw, insisting, as the overwhelming majority of Christian theologians would insist, that salvation outside the economy of the Incarnation is impossible. Buttressing himself with a natural movement of charity and with an assertion of St. Paul (Rom. II. 14) that the pagans, not knowing the law, are a law unto themselves, Dryden says: "tho' no name be for salvation known,/ But that of his eternal Son's alone;/ Who knows how far transcending goodness can/ Extend the merits of that Son to man?" Dryden's Pauline emphasis, which Rand refers to as the very foundation of Christian humanism,[32] strongly suggests that Dryden's "scepticism" is of a very special kind indeed. Dryden's assertion that "those who followed Reason's dictates right" "may [also] see their Maker's face" corrects the impression that he perhaps made earlier about the exclusive character of Christian ethics, while preserving (by means of the subjunctive *may*) the view of salvation as a gift. This is, of course, far from submission to the Deists. Their precise point was that the common notions (rationally derivable) can perform a function which Dryden, like most Anglicans, restricts to a very special economy — the economy of grace, the only known centre of which lies in the mystery of the Incarnation.

[30] This is not to deny, of course, the subtle changes which were occurring in the *way* in which the relationship between nature and grace was being viewed. Cf. Bethell, The Cultural Revolution, 58, for a description of the *narrowing* of the concept of reason that is responsible for the grave differences in tone which complicate the apparent agreement between Hooker and Tillotson.

[31] John Donne, Works, ed. H. Alford (London, 1839), II, 7.

[32] E. K. Rand, Founders of the Middle Ages (Cambridge, Mass., 1929), 35.

Dryden then moves to a discussion which Bredvold sees as most explicitly pointing to Dryden's scepticism. This is the digression in praise of the translator of Father Simon's Critical History of the New Testament, and is devoted, in large measure, to the problem of finding "a generally accepted method for interpreting, for purposes of church discipline and morality, the truth which God reveals in His Scripture." [33] This, as we have seen, was a problem perennial to any system of Christianity which lays no claim to being infallible. But there is no evidence, in spite of Bredvold, that Dryden was unduly affected by the attempt of Father Simon to undermine the Protestant confidence in Scripture. He falls back, as other Anglicans had done, on the assurance that on all needful points Scripture is plain. The poem at this point, as a matter of fact, reflects the serenity of Dryden in the face of the potent Catholic argument that admitted difficulties of interpretation point to the necessity of an infallible Church. To suppose, with Bredvold, that the couplet, "Such an omniscient Church we wish indeed,/ 'T were worth both testaments; and cast in the creed" is a reflection of Dryden's disturbance at the fundamental lack of authority within Protestantism is to read Religio Laici in the light of the later Hind and the Panther. To suggest that a poem which is consistently critical of the Deists, the Puritans and the Catholics, is suddenly startled into a tone of yearning for the bosom of the Catholic Church is to suggest a Romantic not a Neo-Classic poem. As a matter of fact, this precise attitude, which reflects not yearning for but dismissal of the reality behind the principle of Catholic infallibility, can be found in Anglicans whose intellectualism is not at all suspect. Chillingworth, for example, says: ". . . if I knew any one Church to be infallible, I would quickly be of that Church." [34] William Sherlock, whom Bredvold does not place on the road to Rome, says in A Discourse Concerning a Judge of Controversies in Matters of Religion (1686): "Now could they prove that the Church of Rome is infallible, this indeed would be an irresistible Reason to return to her Communion. . . ." [35]

[33] Baker, Wars of Truth, 191.
[34] Anglicanism, 113.
[35] Quoted in Bredvold, Intellectual Milieu, 94.

Like any other Anglican, Dryden cites Father Simon's argument for the necessity of an infallible judge of tradition only to reject it. But typical of Anglicanism, he falls back to a position which methodologically is much like that of Rome. For, says he, "In doubtful questions 't is the safest way/ To learn what unsuspected ancients say;/ For 't is not likely we should higher soar/ In search of heav'n than all the church before." Bredvold's comment on this conservatism in Dryden is that Dryden here yielded "an obedience to the Church of England by law established, more strict than it theoretically could claim and more blind than that Church, in its fear of being identified with Popery, would want to claim." [36] While Bredvold may be correct on the theoretical right of Anglicanism to *demand* the allegiance of the faithful, because of the individualistic principle which informs it, many Anglicans, among them Hooker, Donne, Laud, and countless others,[37] did not hesitate to make this demand, especially against the excessive individualism of the Sectarians. To think of Dryden's attitude as a hankering for authority which removed him from the central tendency of Anglicanism is to mistake the nature of Anglicanism. This is as misleading as Bredvold's view that the Catholic position "that reason appeals to evidence but faith accepts authority" was but a distinction "which the Protestants refused to recognize as valid." [38] For while Hooker (to quote but one instance) defines ecclesiastical law as that "which out of the law either of reason or of God men probably gathering to be expedient, they make it a law," [39] Hooker means by reason not the private reason of the individual but rather the corporate reason of the Church. He insists that that "which the Church by

[36] Bredvold, Intellectual Milieu, 126.

[37] Donne's view of the self-elected saints as the white spots of leprosy in the Church, and Browne's recognition that every "man is not a proper Champion for Truth" as well as Burton's fear of the "fopperies" of private judgment, can be matched by Taylor's comment on the sectarian insistence that conscience is above law: "And so Suspicion; and Jealousie, and Disobedience, and Rebellion are become Conscience; in which there is neither knowledge, nor revelation, nor truth, nor charity, nor reason, nor religion." For these references see Donne, The Works, IV, 511; Browne, Religio Medici (Everyman ed.), 8; Burton, Anatomy of Melancholy (Bohn Library), III, 372; Taylor, Ductor Dubitantium, in L. P. Smith, The Golden Grove (Oxford, 1930), 145.

[38] Bredvold, Intellectual Milieu, 94.

[39] Hooker, Polity, I, iii, 1.

her ecclesiastical authority shall probably think and define to be true or good, must in congruity of reason overrule all other inferior judgments whatsoever." [40]

Like Hooker Dryden does not fall back on the authority of the Church prematurely. For in Dryden the place of reason in the elucidation of the divine text is by no means ignored. Dryden's assertion is clear that if the simple soul "Plods on to heaven, and ne'er is at a loss," nevertheless there are some born to instruct as others to be taught who "must study well the sacred page." The function of such elucidators is to discover "Which doctrine, this, or that, does best agree/ With the whole tenor of the Work divine, / And plainliest points to Heaven's reveal'd design." His specific charge against the Puritans is that in them reason has been replaced by the inner light: "Each was ambitious of th'-obscurest place,/ No measure ta'en from knowledge, all from GRACE./ Study and pains were now no more their care;/ Texts were explain'd by fasting and by prayer:/ This was the fruit the private spirit brought,/ Occasion'd by great zeal and little thought." The distinction that Dryden makes between knowledge and grace by no means suggests any thorough-going repudiation of the activity of reason in religion. Indeed Dryden is anxious to "stem" both the "tides of ignorance" (Puritans) and "pride" (Roman Catholics). It is true that temperamentally Dryden is satisfied with religion in its more simple expression. In the Preface to the Religio, he tells us that the Apostles' Creed is the one best fitted to his weak understanding. But this is an attitude by no means foreign to Anglicanism.[41]

Dryden's opposition to Puritan "ignorance" suggests very strongly that he would be at one with Hooker in insisting that "the benefit of nature's light" must not be "thought excluded as unnecessary, because the necessity of a diviner light is magnified." [42] It would seem clear that to Dryden, as to Hooker, reason is not merely a supplement but a "necessary instrument, without which we could not reap by the Scripture's perfection that fruit

[40] Ibid., V, viii, 5.

[41] Cf. Anglicanism, 121–131, for representatives of those who prefer the Apostles' Creed rather than the more theologically explicit Creeds without, however, intending to undermine the content of those Creeds.

[42] Hooker, Polity, I, xiv, 4.

and benefit which it yieldeth." [43] Furthermore the nature of Dryden's criticism hardly suggests a lack of confidence in reason. He speaks of pre-Reformation times as times "o'er grown with rust and ignorance" when "want of learning" was exploited by priestcraft. Such ignorance gave way to "a knowing age" which refused to accept Roman claims of infallibility. This is quite in the spirit of Hooker who refuses "to be tied and led by authority," and who rejects the notion "that authority of men should prevail with men either against or above Reason, is no part of our belief." [44]

But again like Hooker, when this anti-authoritarianism was pushed within Protestantism by the Puritans, Dryden demurs. Hooker has insisted that "ten thousand general councils" cannot overweigh "one demonstrative reason alleged, or one manifest testimony cited from the mouth of God himself to the contrary. . . ." [45] But faced with the Protestant "genius for schism," [46] he also insists that even in matters of doctrine where no clear proof is presented, if it can be shown that "a number of the learnedest divines" are unified on a particular point, a "somewhat reasonable man" would submit. For although it would not be clear "what reason or what Scripture" had led to such unanimity, the reasonable man would be deterred from opposition by a recognition of "the common imbecilities which are incident into our nature." [47] Dryden, aware that this "good" of the Reformation has had "full bad a consequence" whereby "he was gifted most that loudest bawl'd," falls back on the proposition that in "doubtful questions 't is the safest way/ To learn what unsuspected ancients say." Moreover, "if after hearing what our Church can say," reason still demurs, Dryden like Hooker, both of them persuaded of "the common imbecilities . . . incident into our nature," recommends that the "private Reason 't is more just to curb / Than by disputes the public peace disturb." Hooker, in his conflict with the Puritans, had already cited the desirability of "some definitive sentence, which being given may

[43] Ibid., III, viii, 10.
[44] Ibid., II, vii, 6.
[45] Ibid., II, vii, 5.
[46] Herschel Baker's phrase, Wars of Truth, 193.
[47] Hooker, Polity, II, vii, 5.

stand, and a necessity of silence on both sides afterwards imposed." [48]

The conclusion to be drawn is that while Dryden sharply criticizes the Deists' substitution of the common notions for the central fact of Christianity — the Incarnation — this cannot with any justification be called scepticism, unless Christianity by definition is a scepticism. For Dryden, reason is of course powerless to achieve our salvation despite the fact that as "the Light of Nature" it is "the next in dignity" to the light of Revelation. But if, as Saint Paul and Anglicans generally say, the pagans are saved by the merciful application of the Incarnation to them, and not by virtue of their natural light, Dryden's criticism of the Deists' claims should not be thought of as unusual. Further, if Dryden prefers his religion simple, he is at one with a number of Anglicans whose central intellectualism is not generally suspect.[49] His opposition to Roman Catholicism is on what he sees as rational grounds; his criticism of the Puritans is on the grounds of their lack of intellectual credit. His traditionalism can be matched at many points within Anglicanism, and constitutes no evidence of scepticism in him. Indeed it would seem that scepticism in the Religio Laici can be found only at the cost of exaggerating the rationalism of seventeenth-century Anglicanism, and of too readily assuming that seventeenth-century Roman Catholic "fideism" has no recognizable methodological affinities with this Anglicanism. One is led to the further conclusion that if Dryden had not become a Catholic, and had not written the Hind and the Panther, the evidence of his turning to Rome and of his leanings to scepticism would, with respect to the Religio, have remained quite unsuspected.[50]

Dryden's opposition to Deism, Sectarianism, and Catholicism

[48] Ibid., Pref., vi, 4.

[49] Bredvold, Intellectual Milieu, 87, quotes the Independent John Owen's answer to the Franciscan John Vincent Canes, the first of whom Bredvold considers rationalistic, the second fideistic: "This Protestants think sufficient for them, who as they need not to be wise above what is written; nor to know more of God, than he hath so revealed of himself, that they may know it. . . ." This seems to be essentially the position of Dryden, and so it is difficult to see how a sturdy rationalism in Owen can become metamorphosed into conclusive evidence of Dryden's hankering for authority.

[50] I am now preparing an article which discusses the general question of Dryden's Catholicism.

represents, therefore, not a lack of confidence in human reason but an attempt to reassert a basic Christian humanism which he found to be endangered by the secularism of the Deists, the anti-intellectualism of the Sectarians, and the excessive claims of the Catholics. That he will eventually recognize Catholicism to be a Christian humanism which most adequately resolves the traditional tensions between nature and grace has no bearing on his position at the time of the Religio Laici. At this point, he is securely within the tradition of Anglican Christian humanism.

BOOKS RECEIVED

AIΩN DA OMERO AD ARISTOTELE. [*per*] *Enzo Degani.* Padova, Cedam — Casa Editrice Dott. Antonio Milani, 1961. 158p. (Università di Padova. Pubblicazioni Della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia, Vol. XXXVII.)

AMERICA: A SKETCH OF ITS POLITICAL, SOCIAL, AND RELIGIOUS CHARACTER. *By Philip Schaff. Edited by Perry Miller.* Cambridge, Massachusetts, Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1961. xxxv, 241p. (A John Harvard Library Book.)

BEYOND TRAGEDY; ESSAYS ON THE CHRISTIAN INTERPRETATION OF HISTORY. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons [c.1937]. xi, 306p. (The Scribner Library.)

LE CHRIST ET LA FOI; ÉTUDE DE THÉOLOGIE BIBLIQUE. *Par Pierre Vallotton.* Genève, Labor et Fides, 1960. 171p.

CHRISTIANITY AND HISTORY. *By Herbert Butterfield.* New York, Charles Scribner's Sons [c.1949, 1950]. vi, 146p. (The Scribner Library.)

CONTEMPORARY THEORIES OF KNOWLEDGE. *By Thomas English Hill.* New York, Ronald Press Company, 1961. vii, 583p.

CRITIQUE ET MORALE CHEZ KANT. Philosophie und Moral in der Kantischen Kritik. [*by*] *Gerhard Krueger.* Traduit *par M. Regnier.* Preface *d'Eric Weil.* Paris, Beauchesne et ses fils [1961]. 275p.

DISORDERS OF THE EMOTIONAL AND SPIRITUAL LIFE. *By W. L. Northridge.* Great Neck, New York, Channel Press [1961]. [vii] 130p.

THE ENGLISH BIBLE: A HISTORY OF TRANSLATIONS. *By F. F. Bruce. . . .* New York, Oxford University Press, 1961. xiv, 233p.

INSTITUTES OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION, [*by*] *Calvin.* In two volumes (vol. XX: Books I.i to III.xix). *Edited by John T. McNeill.* Translated *by Ford Lewis Battles . . .* in collaboration with *the editor and a committee of advisors.* Philadelphia, The Westminster Press [1960]. 2v. (Library of Christian Classics, 20, 21.)

LIFE'S LONG JOURNEY. *By Kenneth Walker.* New York, Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1961. 191p.

MORAL MAN AND IMMORAL SOCIETY. *By Reinhold Niebuhr.* New York, Charles Scribner's Sons [1960]. xxv, 284p. (The Scribner Library.)

THE NEW ENGLISH BIBLE. NEW TESTAMENT. Oxford University Press, Cambridge University Press, 1961. xiii, 447p.

ONE LORD, ONE BAPTISM. *World Council of Churches Commission on Faith and Order.* Report on The Divine Trinity and the Unity of the Church and Report on The Meaning of Baptism *by the Theological Commission on Christ and the Church.* (Faith and Order Commission Paper No. 29.) 79p. (Studies in Ministry and Worship, 17.)

NIHILISM; ITS ORIGIN AND NATURE — WITH A CHRISTIAN ANSWER. *By Helmut Thielicke.* Translated by *John W. Doberstein.* New York, Harper & Brothers [1961]. 186p. (Religious Perspectives, 4.)

THE PASTORAL CALLING. *By Paul Rowntree Clifford.* Great Neck, New York, Channel Press [1961]. 144p.

A PSYCHOLOGY FOR PREACHING. *By Edgar N. Jackson.* Preface *by Harry Emerson Fosdick.* Great Neck, New York, Channel Press [1961]. 189p.

PSYCHOTHERAPY AND A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF MAN. *By David E. Roberts.* New York, Charles Scribner's Sons [c.1950]. xiv, 161p. (The Scribner Library.)

REASON AND REVELATION IN THE MIDDLE AGES. *By Etienne Gilson.* New York, Charles Scribner's Sons [c.1938]. 114p. (The Scribner Library.)

THE RECOVERY OF CONFIDENCE. [*By*] *E. H. Robertson.* New York, Association Press [1961]. 63p. (The Bible in Our Time.)

THE REFORM OF LITURGICAL WORSHIP; PERSPECTIVES AND PROSPECTS. *By Massey Hamilton Shepherd, Jr.* New York, Oxford University Press, 1961. viii, 118p. (Bohlen Lectures, 1959.)

THE SHAKING OF THE FOUNDATIONS. *By Paul Tillich.* New York, Charles Scribner's Sons [c.1948]. 186p. (The Scribner Library.)

STUDI DI POESIA EOLICA. [*per*] *Benedetto Marzullo.* Firenze, Felice Le Monnier, 1958. xii, 212p.

TRAITÉ DE LA NATURE. [*de*] *Isidore de Seville. Édité par Jacques Fontaine.* . . . Bordeaux, Féret et Fils, Éditeurs, 1960. 466p. (Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études Hispaniques, 28.)

Ouvrage Publié avec le concours du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

VICTORY OVER SUFFERING; GLIMPSES INTO A MYSTERY. *By A. Graham Ikin.* Foreword *by J. B. Phillips.* Introduction *by Edward Ely.* Great Neck, New York, Channel Press [1961]. 144p.

WILLIAM OF NEWBURGH'S EXPLANATIO SACRI EPITHALAMII IN MATREM SPONSI. A COMMENTARY ON THE CANTICLE OF CANTICLES (12th-C.). *By John C. Gorman.* Fribourg, Switzerland, University Press, 1960. x, 369p.